

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF KARL MARX

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



April 15th, 1933

VOLUME X

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL No. 7

TEN CENTS
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 7

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

1. THE COLLAPSE OF WEIMAR GERMANY AND THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE GERMAN OCTOBER

(See page 211)

2. 50th ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF KARL MARX

(See page 219)

1. Letter to Proudhon, 1846
2. Letter to Kottgen, 1846
3. At the Fountain Head of the International
Communist Movement

L. PERCHIK

3. THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE WAR OF JAPAN IN CHINA

L. MADYAR

(See page 225)

4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA

VALIA (Conclusion from No. 2).

(See page 230)

5. QUESTIONS OF CONCRETE AND OPERATIVE PARTY LEADERSHIP

O. BEVER

(See page 236)

6. OUR MARTYRS

(See page 240)

THE COLLAPSE OF WEIMAR GERMANY AND PREPARATION FOR THE GERMAN OCTOBER

UNPRECEDENTED fascist terror is rife in Germany. Bourgeois reaction, united under the banner of the Hitler government, and combining the might of German monopolist capital, the military barracks of Prussian junkerdom, and the Hitler legions of petty-bourgeois elements literally enraged by the horrors of the crisis, is trying to ground down the German proletariat beneath its heel. After an avalanche of pogrom speeches and soldier marches lasting for thirty days and thirty nights, after "a little blood letting" during the daily repressions and murder of revolutionary workers, the fascist dictatorship of united bourgeois reaction has turned to *organised State terror* against the working class and its Communist vanguard. All the "best people" from the gentlemen's clubs, and all the frantic fascist captains, united in common hatred of Socialism and bestial horror of the rising tide of the mass revolutionary movement, have turned to acts of provocation, to foul incendiarism, to mediæval legends of poisoned wells, to legalise their own destruction of proletarian organisations, and rouse the agitated petty-bourgeoisie to chauvinistic fervour on behalf of the fight against the revolutionary way out of the crisis. The Hitler-Papen-Hugenberg fascist government hopes to stop the wheel of proletarian revolutionary history by its methods of savage terror, torture and shootings.

But it is not within their power to stay the indomitable advance of history! The new emergency law against the Communists will cost the German proletariat big sacrifices. But this means also that the revolutionary movement will develop and all the contradictions of German and international capitalism will increase still more. The open fascist dictatorship of the National-Socialists in Germany signifies a new historic stage in the post-war decay of capitalism, in the bankruptcy of international social-democracy, in the struggle of the international proletariat for a revolutionary way out of the crisis. The lies and calumnies, at once absurd, gross and foul, against the Communist Party, the bestial reprisals against the revolutionary proletarians, could not, and cannot, drown the hatred which the working class feels for its exploiters, and the workers' eagerness for battle and militant unity. Almost five million votes cast in favour of the German Communist Party during the "shillelagh" elections to the Reichstag are sufficient proof thereof.

The fiendish fascist dictatorship cannot kill the growing contradictions; it can only increase

them. Fascism in Germany is not merely the reinforcement and organisation of bourgeois reaction, but also the convulsions of German and international capitalism in the critical circumstances in which the German and international bourgeoisie is situated.

It is no accident that the entire international bourgeoisie—Conservative and Liberal—with all the inner contradictions existing between them, and particularly within German capitalism, nevertheless quietly approve Hitler's fascist terror against the Communist Party. Never before have the words of the "Communist Manifesto," to the effect that in the war against Communism the capitalists are the most consistent collectivists, been so clearly justifiable as now. "We are not only defending Germany," says Goehring in his proclamation. To which must be replied: we know all about that. "*My pen is full of enthusiasm . . . I cannot feel otherwise, for no one else in my generation, who saw the slaughter of the Russian revolution, can write differently . . .*" Thus writes a Polish landlord, Matskevich, in the Vilna "Slovo," undoubtedly expressing the thoughts and expectations of the whole of the bourgeoisie. Hitler is attending to the *internal* affairs of the bourgeoisie of every capitalist country in Europe, but at the same time his advent to power has most forcefully sharpened the contradictions of the European imperialists; now the question of *war* is on the agenda for all capitalist Europe.

The question of *defending the German Communist Party* is now the business of the *whole of international Communism*. The question of defending the German working class is now the *vital problem* of the entire international proletarian revolution. Whereas the working class of old Russia set up the first country of proletarian dictatorship, and the mighty historic mission of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. to-day is to build Socialism in one, single country, the German worker to-day is confronted with another mighty historic task—to demolish fascist dictatorship in Germany, which would mean the victory of the proletarian revolution throughout Central Europe. The task of the victorious proletarian dictatorship in Germany will be infinitely more simple, for the proletarians of Soviet Germany will build Socialism in league with the U.S.S.R. The victory or defeat of the German proletariat is of first-class importance to the whole of capitalist Europe. Every Communist should realise this now.

What is the alignment of class forces in Germany?

The March 5 elections to the German Reichstag made it quite obvious that the German working-class is hostile to fascist dictatorship, and that it was able to offer resistance to fascism at the elections in spite of terror hitherto unprecedented in the history of Germany, in spite of the fact that it is still divided, and a considerable section of the organised proletariat still follow social-democracy and are linked up with democratic illusions; that among masses of millions of proletarians, even *to-day* the determination to enter the last fight to the death against fascist dictatorship is not yet matured. But the elections to the German Reichstag revealed still more. The National-Socialists, cast up on a mighty wave of nationalism, by means of ferocious terror, licentious, chauvinistic propaganda, terrifying the petty-bourgeois philistines with stories of the "horrors" of proletarian revolution, and engaging in social-demagogy, chiefly in the villages—were able to get 17,265,000 votes. Together with Hugenberg's party—the chief party of German monopolist capital and the chief driving force of the offensive against the standard of living of the toilers, the National-Socialists have now an absolute majority. It is no secret that the fascist bands, more particularly in the far distant corners of the provinces of Germany, did not hesitate to wangle the count. In certain parts the National-Socialists contrived to obtain 130 per cent. of the votes! But the fact that the National-Socialists have increased their vote, primarily in the agricultural districts of Germany, still remains true. The greatest increase in the number of votes to the National-Socialists came from Bavaria and Eastern Prussia. The national-socialists, by terror and deception, were able to a considerable extent, to isolate the German proletariat from the petty-bourgeoisie of town and village. The ferocious violence of the Hitler bands against the German proletariat would have been impossible, had the petty-bourgeois masses not blessed them with their agreement and "amens."

From its first advent to power, the Hitler government took the line of using *the village against the proletarian town*. Having come to power the national-socialists rapidly changed their anti-capitalist "poetry" for arch-bourgeois and junker prose. Was it so long ago that the national-socialists promised to abolish unemployment, to confiscate the land of the landowners, and to nationalise the trusts? This was all part of their programme in 1920 and after. Only three months have passed since the day when the leftest Nazi demagogue Göbbels declared in the

"Sportpalast" that within twenty-four hours of the advent to power of the national-socialists the rapacious, anti-labour decrees introduced by von Papen would be repealed. To ensure the success of the election, Hitler is now only able to grant concessions in the form of the distribution of a morsel of bread and fat, and an increase of two marks a month in the unemployment benefits; these concessions will be lost in the near future as a result of the increased cost of living in consequence of inflation. Hitler now calls upon the workers to give him from four to thirty years. Just like the "iron Chancellor" Bismarck (whose heir he imagines himself to be), he has "let down his trousers and revealed to the crowd the hind-quarters of his right to work." (Engels to Bebel in 1881.)

During Hitler's month in power the army of unemployed has not only not diminished, but has increased by fifty thousand. Dr. Bangke, the new Secretary of State in the Hugenberg ministry of "economic dictatorship," at a special convention of nationalist factory owners (the Hugenberg party) specially emphasised the fact that the new government "has not the slightest intention of engaging in social and political experiments." The national-socialists fulfil their consistent rôle of *landsknechten** of German monopolist capital. The radical difference in the situation when Hitler's fascist dictatorship came to power in Germany, and Italian fascism took over in 1922, when capitalism was proceeding towards relative stabilisation, was sufficient from the very first days to reveal the deception of national-socialist social-demagogy to vast masses of the proletariat. But, to arm the village against the proletarian town, and first and foremost in the interests of the Prussian junkers and the village kulaks, the Hitler-Hugenberg united fascist dictatorship issued a decree for a moratorium on rural debts until October, 1933. This moratorium was a special election manoeuvre. The raising of customs duties upon all imported agricultural produce was another election manoeuvre in the direct interests of the Prussian junkers. In some cases customs duties were increased four to five times.

These measures, introduced exclusively in the interests of large-scale agrarian capital and the kulaks, on the one hand, increase the contradictions between industrial and agrarian capital, and the struggle of the capitalists for a share in plundering the German toiling masses still more, and, on the other, nevertheless, created a favourable atmosphere, before the elections to the Reichstag, for socially deceiving the toiling masses of the German village by means of Hitler's

* Serfs.

demagogy. This is the more so, since the Communist Party of Germany, of late, has considerably lessened its attention to the task of politically winning the urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie and bringing them over to its side. The March 5th elections showed that considerable sections of the middle and small peasantry fell victims to the nationalist social-demagogy of the national-socialists.

The Hitler government, which is a government of the most highly developed fascist dictatorship in Germany—whose open advent to power was realised under Papen by the July 20th coup d'état—is not able to solve a single one of the contradictions of German capitalism. On the contrary, all the main contradictions of German capitalism which Hitler inherited from the previous fascist dictatorship governments of Papen and Schleicher: the extremely intense class struggle, the competitive struggle among various groups of German capital, the tariff war against foreign capitalist States, the fight against the federalist governments of the separate German States (Bavaria, Wurttemberg, Saxony), and finally Germany's gradual isolation on the arena of foreign politics—all these contradictions *have met with further intensification to an extent hitherto unprecedented*. The period to come will doubtless be a period during which the struggle inside the Hitler-Hugenberg bloc itself will be widely developed, as already proved by the fight around the question of the policy of inflation, around the appointment of Schacht to the position of President of the Reichsbank, and the struggle for posts in the Reichswehr among the national-socialists and the "Steel Helmet."

Already on the eve of the burning of the Reichstag, participators at the conference of leaders of the Steel Helmet in Berlin openly complained of the "lack of discipline" on the part of the storm troops who had been "given the wildest promises"; and talked about Göerhring and Frick as not "being big enough" for the State posts occupied by them. Simultaneously at the conference of leaders of the storm troops the opinion was voiced almost as openly that allies on the Harzburg front must be got rid of in the government.

German monopolist capital, seeking to hasten on the capitalist way out of the crisis, put Hitler's fascist dictatorship of national-socialists in power in the place of Schleicher the "social general," who was unable to create an atmosphere of internal political confidence. But already one month's sojourn in power on the part of Hitler's government shows that you cannot feed the unemployed millions on soldiers' marches, that the unrestrained growth of the economic crisis in Germany

cannot be stopped by Hitler's and Göbbels' "teutonic" eloquence. In not more than two weeks, from February 10th to 24th, the rate of exchange of all German bills on the New York Exchange has dropped by almost 10 per cent.* At the same time, despite a certain tendency for the world situation to improve in certain branches of industry in the autumn of 1932, which evoked joyful "prognoses" from bourgeois economists and their social-fascist chorus at the time, about "the beginning of the end of the economic crisis in January and February, 1933,"¹ there has once more been a catastrophic drop in the output of German industry.

However much the German bourgeoisie may be serving the fascist dictator at the present time, the economic development, the contradictions of the economic crisis and the economic policy pursued by the fascist dictatorship are causing more and more upheavals. Time was when, during the discussion of the legislation against socialists in the German Reichstag, one liberal representative of the German bourgeoisie at least was found, a certain Bart, who hurled the contemptuous sobriquet at Chancellor Bismarck: "Comedian!" Another such representative of bourgeois democracy was not to be found, of course, in Germany to-day. He was not to be found in the ranks of German social democracy, either. Yet all the increasing contradictions of German capitalism protrude from the cracks in the Hitler-Hugenberg fascist dictatorship. The greatest representatives of monopolist capital are raising their voices more and more against the "one-sided" economic policy of the government, which is killing the export of German industry. During the middle of February, even, the Presidium of the German League of Industrialists, with Krupp as president, had to declare that "in its attitude to the new government, moreover, the position of industry will depend upon its economic and political measures." Karl Friedrich von Siemens, the leader of the big Siemens concern, was especially emphatic on this point at the annual conference of the concern.

"To all the difficulties which existed before," said he, "there has been added yet another tendency to consolidate the economic position of only one class, which is leading to a contraction of the trade between German and other countries."

As a result, the economic leader of fascist Germany, Hugenberg, who threw back the junker cliché that only two per cent. of the population are affected by the export industries of Germany, was compelled, nevertheless, through his Secretary of State, Dr. Bangke, to declare:

* These have since shown a further decline.—Ed.

"There must be no experimenting with economy . . . the government should subject itself neither to creditors nor to debtors . . . the demand for subsidies, primarily as regards competitors, should be turned down . . ."

Simultaneously the contradictions between the central government and *individual States*, which are protesting against the attempt to institute a system of commissars on the part of the Hitler-Hugenberg central government, have increased. And the crushing of the Bavarian national party and the federalist opposition in several other countries after March 5th did not, of course, destroy these contradictions, but only drove them deeper in.

From the point of view of foreign politics, the process of German isolation has increased gigantically, thanks to the very fact of the advent of the national-socialists to power. The formation of an "organised pact" on the part of the Little Entente was French imperialism's first reply to the advent of Hitler to power, and the rumours of a triple alliance between Germany, Italy and Hungary, which were spread immediately after the formation of the Hugenberg government. On February 12th the Paris correspondent of the "Frankfurter Zeitung" wrote that "the tensivity in connection with the foreign political situation of Germany during the last few days has grown at a terrifying rate." Germany found herself absolutely isolated at the Disarmament Conference. The interview between Hitler and the English correspondent of the "Sunday Express" caused considerable excitement. For the first time Hitler raised the question of revising the Versailles system, and had to immediately deny the interview.

The attempt to bring pressure to bear upon Austria is still, for the time being, unsuccessful. In connection with the threat of French imperialism, after the Hirtenberg incident, to close credits in Austria, Hitler, who wanted to create a uniform régime throughout German Central Europe, made an attempt to get the Austrian national-socialists into the government by promising them financial support to capitalist Austria, in the throes of the heavy economic crisis, in return. Hitler summoned Gadich, the leader of the Austrian national-socialists, to Berlin and through him, made an offer of 75 million marks to the Austrian government on condition that the national-socialists are brought into the government and new elections to parliament held (hoping, apparently, for a big increase in national-socialist votes). Hitler did not come to an agreement with the Austrian leading ultra-reactionary christian-socialist party; and the other fascist anti-Hitler organisation, the Heimwehr (which share the opposition with the

Bavarian national party) replied to Hitler's counter-revolutionary advance in Germany with their own counter-revolutionary offensive in Austria. This was prevented by the international situation in Austria. Hitler helped to isolate Germany by his demagogic, provocative attacks against the U.S.S.R.

Finally, before the burning of the Reichstag, the signal for the most licentious reign of terror, Hitler had been unable, even with the terror that grew day by day to prevent workers' demonstrations and the growing resistance of the masses. Whereas the C.P.G., before the burning of the Reichstag and the open use of all the armed forces of bourgeois Germany against the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, had been unable to form *all-inclusive* unity among the German proletariat, now the successes of the united front under the leadership of the C.P.G. began to grow daily. This is proved by all the demonstrations and the general strikes in Lubeck, Stassfurt and Harzburg and 300 political strikes which took place during this month in Germany under the leadership of the C.P.G. We have proof of this in the first results of the elections to factory committees before February 27th. In 16 of the largest undertakings, where social-democracy previously had an overwhelming majority (83 per cent. of the total vote in 1929), only 44 per cent. voted for the social-democratic list, and the Communists increased their vote to 33 per cent.

Thus the hopes of the fascist dictatorship of rapidly creating a "strong State and healthy economy" were confronted with the ever-increasing contradictions of German capitalism. It was just this that prompted the Hitler-Hugenberg government to force the "Fascist tiger," Captain Gœhring, to jump upon the German working class, through the Reichstag he had burned, and to kill two birds with one stone: to smash the working class and secure a majority in the Reichstag. This "jump" was *carefully weighed and prepared*. We have proof of this in the fact that the leaders of monopolist capital in Germany themselves in the famous bulletin "Deutsche Führerbriefe," intended for captains of industry, and captains of incendiarism and pogroms, on the very day of the burning of the Reichstag published an exact forecast of the whole trend of further events, and gave away the whole programme of action of fascist dictatorship. This is confirmed by the sensational revelations of preparations for the fire given in the "Populaire."

The elections brought an absolute majority to the Harzburg bloc. The centre has lost its key position. Owing to the "removal" of the Communist deputies, the national-socialists will themselves actually have a majority in the Potsdam

parliament. But this does not in the least mitigate the further deepening of contradictions among the German bourgeoisie, but on the contrary rather augments it. Already two days after the elections to the Reichstag the organ of big capital, the "Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung," agitatedly stated that "the bourgeois-national group, including the black-white-and-red-front, have suffered a devastating defeat . . . and this fact, although unexpected, nevertheless depicts the future in not particularly bright colours." The same paper notes the further isolation of Germany in foreign politics and gives warning against those who issue the slogan: "We don't give a hang for anyone." This is obviously the question of the violent, offensive policy of the national-socialists at present; their heads have been turned by the 17 million votes, they are extending their front of struggle more and more. Having deceived broad masses of the petty-bourgeoisie, the national-socialists, who have nothing with which to redeem the bills they have issued, have to cast round for new effective "victories." This, they hoped, would deaden the hunger of the toiling masses, and the growing contradictions of the German bourgeoisie. The weapon they use in this connection is torture, shootings, murder of Communist workers, social-democrats and non-party workers. The weapon they use is the war hazard, open propaganda of war, reckless adventurism as regards foreign policy, all the insolent, anti-Soviet antics of fascist brutality. This is also an explanation for the intense rapidity with which commissars were appointed to certain districts, the crushing of the Bavarian government, and appointing the fascist general von Epp as Hitler's right-hand man in Bavaria. The national-socialists are beginning arrests and shootings even against individual leaders of social-democracy and the trade union bureaucracy, in order to get full control of social-democracy and make the trade unions fascist, on the Italian pattern.

Thus German fascism can offer to the German toilers no other prospect but that of war, rabid capitalist exploitation and deprivation of all political rights. At present the initiative is taken by the fascist dictatorship of united bourgeois reaction and the national-socialist party, which, for a period, has been able to bring over huge masses of the petty-bourgeoisie to its side. The nationalist fervour of the petty-bourgeoisie, and especially of the youth, has been trained already by all the foregoing education of social-democracy. Was it not Ebert, the first President of the November Republic, who met the soldiers returning from the front with chauvinistic, revengeful slogans like: "You are not returning home defeated!" Was it not social-democracy, when

in power in the November Republic, which educated and pushed forward the creator of the Reichswehr and unsuccessful candidate among German Napoleons, General von Seckt, who advanced the "social general" Schleicher, and many other fascist generals and police-presidents, who are now, filled with the fear of God, shooting certain of the leaders of German social-democracy, together with Communist and social-democratic workers?

But however great the initiative of fascist counter-revolution, it cannot destroy the deep hatred of the working class for fascism, and its eagerness for a united front of revolutionary struggle; it cannot bridge the mighty gulf that has formed itself in German capitalism; it cannot avoid the counter-initiative of the Communist vanguard or the counter-offensive of the working class, led by the Communist Party. It cannot overcome the deep source, in general, of the inevitable crisis of fascist dictatorship. And this source is the poverty and indignation of the masses, which is now past all bounds.

And hence, moreover, the intense desire for unity on the part of the working masses. The task of devastating this frenzied fascist dictatorship makes it essential for every German worker to realise at all costs the united front of proletarian class struggle, and to tear millions of urban and rural petty bourgeois toiling masses away from national socialism. But it will be possible to tear the petty bourgeoisie away from fascism only when it is convinced of the deception of fascist social-demagogy, when it believes in the strength of the working class, and the capability of the Communist vanguard to lead a victorious struggle for proletarian dictatorship.

In order to hasten on the process of isolating national-socialism from the deceived petty-bourgeois masses, and thus lessen the misery of the working class at the hands of fascist hangmen, it is primarily essential that there should be militant unity among the working class itself. Up to now social-democracy has stood in the way of this unity, and step by step, through its tactic of the "lesser evil," its betrayal on July 20th, its sabotage of the general strike on January 30th, has disrupted the working class struggle, and gradually brought it under the present blows of bloody, fascist terror. As a mass organisation German social-democracy is between two mill-stones — Communism and social-nationalism — and its leaders, on the one hand, utter "left" slogans in favour of the united front to blackmail the bourgeoisie and trick the workers, and, on the other, have been, and are still, crawling on their bellies to fascist dictatorship, if only it will leave social-democracy just a little of the mass basis,

and the chance to "hold things over." On January 30th social-democracy assured the workers that "it is too early to fight," that they "should prepare," that Hitler was still ruling on the basis of the constitution, that they should wait and see whether he would really violate the constitution, and that "at present there is no reason for a general strike." This was the essence of the speech of Urich, the Berlin trade union bureaucrat, delivered on January 30th, in the evening, at a conference of social-democratic functionaries. This was the essence of the speech, at the same time, of the one-time independent Breitscheid, who, six weeks previously, in connection with the dock-tailed amnesty declared by Schleicher, at a social-democratic meeting in Weissensee, stated:

"We support the amnesty in order to destroy the cruel sentences of the Papen emergency courts. We are against amnesty in general, because it can be used in favour of political criminals" . . .

On March 1st the social-democrat leaders were already assuring the workers that "now everything was finished," "now we can do nothing," now we must wait until fascism dies out of itself. On March 1st these "leaders" were on their knees before the Fascist dictators, imploring them for mercy and the honourable rôle of "opposition to His Fascist Majesty" in the imperial stables of Potsdam. Social-democracy is chiefly to blame for the fact that a mass political strike on January 30th was not possible on a broad scale. It is chiefly to blame for the fact that the German proletariat was systematically disarmed by social democracy, and temporarily relaxed its initiative. But the German proletariat will renew this initiative, under the leadership of the Communist Party. And by disarming the working masses, social-democracy prepared its own end. Social-democracy, as a mass party of millions, will inevitably be smashed. Many of the Welses and Leiparts are already now preparing for a jump from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom . . . "of the third empire." Nothing is left of social-democracy — except what fascist dictatorship allows it.

* * *

It is for this reason that it is of imperative importance that the Communist Party of Germany make it clear to every social-democratic worker, to every member of the reformist trade unions, as to *who* is fighting against fascism, as to *who* is forming and capable of forming the united front of the German working class. When on January 25th, in reply to the provocative demonstration of fascists outside Liebknecht House, one hundred thousand workers answered the call of the Com-

munist Party and came out on to the streets. Stampfer, the editor of "Vorwaerts," overcome by the rousing spectacle of the demonstration, and the impotence of social-democracy, became convinced of the growing might of the united front movement; he uttered winged words: "You, Communists, are wrong when you say that we are betraying the workers; our language is, indeed, the language of the workers." The truth really is that the leaders of social democracy catch hold of and *stimulate* the mood of the more backward, conservative strata of the working class, so as to infect the whole working class and sabotage the revolutionary, proletarian class struggle. It is the task of the Communists to deprive the Stampfers of their stings. There is no country in the world where the Communist International manifesto on the united front for joint class action is of such effect, is so devastating, as it is for the leaders of social-democracy in Germany. Before the Communist Party of Germany to-day is an exceptional opportunity indeed of winning the *majority of the working class*. The Communist International manifesto deprives the social-democratic leaders of their last chance of speculating on demagogic slogans about "non-aggression pacts," and the "disrupting" tactics of the Communists.

The leaders of German social-democracy, of course, are not thinking at present of any militant united front against fascism, have no intention of any *front* against fascist dictatorship at all. The united front slogan—for them—has always been merely a means of disrupting and sabotaging the real revolutionary struggle against fascism. They know full well that the realisation of a militant united front among the proletariat would mean suicide for them.

Consequently the primary task of the German Communists now is to realise the united front of the proletariat *everywhere possible*. For it is a question of winning over the social-democratic workers for a fight against national-socialism and against social-democracy, which capitulates to the former.

The national-socialists have been unable to penetrate into the workshops and factories on a wide scale. But the elections showed that they had been able to bring along in their train a certain section of the unemployed, partly by offering them petty social concessions and deceptive promises of work, even of the hardest form of labour. It would be harmful self-deception not to perceive the successes of the national-socialists in several industrial districts among the backward strata of the proletariat, especially in certain of the textile districts of Saxony. Engels, as far back as 1881, wrote as follows:—

" . . . They are not a real nucleus for a big national movement. Their poverty — as in 1865-70 — makes them, in certain conditions, easily susceptible to socialist propaganda, more so than the workers in big towns. But it is this very poverty that also makes them more inconstant. A drowning man catches at a straw, and cannot wait until the boat is launched from the shore to bring him help. The boat is the socialist revolution, the straw is protective tariffs and State socialism." (Letter from Engels to Bernstein, November, 1881.)

These words of Engels are of vital significance nowadays, since they reveal the danger of the fascist social poison of to-day. Fascism has been unable to penetrate into the depths of the working class, especially of its vanguard—the metal-workers; and never will. But it would be extremely feckless, a crime to the cause of the working class, to leave events to themselves, on the grounds that the working class is immune from fascist propaganda. The drowning Saxon textile worker will only stop grasping at a "straw" when he is sure that the "boat" is coming towards him, steered by a determined, experienced pilot, and that it is able to save him.

At the same time the German Communist Party must considerably increase its fight to tear the petty bourgeoisie away from national-socialism. In reply to the moratorium of the Hitler Government, the Communist Party should issue a militant slogan to the rural toilers calling for the abolition of moratoriums for junkers and kulaks, abolition of all subsidies to agrarian capital ("Osthilfe," etc.), annulment of all debts accumulated by the rural toilers, abolition of duties on industrial goods. The fight is not to support bankrupt, large, agrarian capital, but to confiscate their land and transfer it unconditionally to the landless peasants, to those with very little land, and to the agricultural workers.

On the other hand, the Communist Party of Germany, in revealing the charlatan character of national-socialist demagogy about the "fight against speculative capital" to the petty-bourgeois masses in the towns, will have an increasing opportunity day by day of showing the town petty-bourgeoisie that Hitler has not removed the factors that are continually declassing and pauperising them, but that it is merely a question of a few hundred thousand posts for Hitler's most active supporters who are eager after a little of the State pie, and that the petty-bourgeoisie are merely so much cannon fodder, the victims of war psychology, of chauvinistic rage, inspired by the fascists, and that it is only the common struggle with the proletariat, led by the proletariat, that

can save it from poverty, from physical and moral degeneration.

* * *

The task of primary importance before the Communist vanguard now is propaganda of internationalism against the new war psychology, and against the new wave of chauvinism and reprisals which the national-socialists have now brought to a climax. The XII. Plenum of the E.C.C.I. formulated this task, but now, with the advent of Hitler to power and the more and more openly manifest adventurism of the fascist dictatorship in the field of foreign politics, there must be certain changes in the Communist method of struggle against the Versailles system, not only in Germany, but also in other capitalist countries. While continuing the consistent fight for Germany's national emancipation, against the Versailles slavery, the Communists should make the centre of their propaganda the work of daily revealing the fact before the masses that the Hitler government is a war government, which will bring inconceivable suffering to the German people and that the national-socialists are the "landsknechten" not only of German monopolist capital, but of the whole of international bourgeois counter-revolution against the land of proletarian dictatorship.

On the other hand, French imperialism, like its agents from the Second International, is now striving to raise the prestige of bourgeois France as "the bulwark of democracy against fascism," and to create the necessary prerequisite for a "sacred unity of nations" inside France. The Communist Party's task in such cases, while mobilising the masses against Hitler fascism, is to concentrate their attack upon the nationalist propaganda of their own bourgeoisie at home, and to unmask the counter-revolutionary character and aims of its "pacifist" slogans.

To win over the broad masses of social-democratic, christian and non-party workers, together with the town and village petty-bourgeois masses, the Communist Party of Germany must show them the clear aim of its revolutionary struggle. Weimar Germany is bankrupt. It is now ancient history. All the social-democratic legends about the "democratic" road to socialism can be very quickly dispersed with it if active work is done. In Germany only two real forces are fighting for power: Communism and Fascism. The question of power, the question of proletarian dictatorship, the question as to what proletarian dictatorship in Germany would do, as compared with what the national-socialists have done, during their first month in power, should occupy the first place. "Down with Hitler's Fascist Government" should be the main, mobilising, political slogan of the

German Communist Party at the present stage of struggle.

The historical period during which the decisive struggle has to be waged for proletarian dictatorship or bourgeois dictatorship is very short in Germany. The German working class lost the initiative for a period. But its revolutionary hatred of the capitalist exploiters, of the fascist violators, has grown threefold, the thirst for militant unity has grown tenfold. The tasks of the German working class and its Communist vanguard are now more complicated, more grave; but they are capable of realisation. This demands more determination and more active work on the part of the German Communist Party (which already has born heavy sacrifices in the fight against fascism, and whose leader, Comrade Thäelmann, is languishing in a fascist gaol, but which has been able to keep its entire party apparatus intact)—in continuing with unabated energy and enthusiasm to lead the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. The more determinedly and rapidly must the Communist Party *rearrange its forces* to suit the new conditions.

Defence of working class political rights, social insurance, and all that has been accumulated as a result of years of stubborn class struggle, defence of the workers' elementary rights, defence of workers' lives and property, the struggle against the fascists' smashing up the trade unions and their seizure of the trade unions — all this will rapidly mobilise the workers and bring about proletarian unity. By taking these immediate tasks as our starting point, by mobilising the masses against fascism and the capitalist offensive, we can lead the working class to a mass, general, political strike, to the violent overthrow of bourgeois rule.

This does not exclude criticism of the policy of the social-democratic and reformist trade union leaders, but, on the contrary, presupposes increased criticism. In this period of grave trial for the German proletariat, the working class masses must feel every day that the Communist Party *is with them, is leading them*, that it stands *at its post. Here lies the chief guarantee of success.* For this very reason the German Communist Party should determinedly and mercilessly fight to overcome all defeatist tendencies, all tendencies to "let things take their course" as regards fascism, which are to be found not only among the social-democratic workers, but also among certain groups in the Communist Party itself, and are the direct results of social-democratic influences. It was just these disintegrating, defeatist, social-democratic slogans and their effect upon certain groups in the German Communist Party, like the parliamentary and constitu-

tional illusions of social-democracy, which were the main reasons for the unsuccessful conversion of separate cases of strikes into a mass, general strike movement throughout Germany after January 30 this year.

The German Communist Party is working in circumstances of such brutal terror for the first time. Fascist dictatorship has forced the German Communist Party underground, hoping in this way to isolate it from the masses.

This makes it essential for the Communists to adopt certain *new forms of work* and to use several *new forms of mobilising the masses*. Often these new forms are put forward from among the working masses themselves. This was the case after January 30, when throughout Germany a wave of small, yet *mass* demonstrations broke out. The German Communist Party must *head all forms of mass resistance* to fascism. The most important thing is that it should be a *mass* movement. The Communist Party must not allow the struggle to be *disunited*, must not give the enemy a chance to break up the revolutionary proletarian vanguard *into sections*.

This further requires that the Communist vanguard rapidly and seriously reinforce its *illegal* organisations, rapidly and seriously develop a broad network of *illegal party newspapers*. But at the same time it requires simultaneously from the Communist vanguard its maximum penetration into all *legal* mass organisations, a skilful combination of legal and illegal work, which is *specially important at the present stage* of revolutionary struggle of the German proletariat. This means, first of all, that maximum attention should be paid to work in the trade unions, because:

"It (the trade union organisation) is the true class organisation of the proletariat, in which it carries on its daily struggle against capitalism, and which is at the same time its school, which even the blackest reaction cannot smother now." (Letter from Engels to Bebel, 1875.)

German fascism, while trying to smash the trade unions, and contracting their present mass basis, is at the same time striving to get into the trade unions and get control of them. On the other hand, the change in the reformist trade union bureaucracy towards fascism will consist just in this (*and the process has already begun*), that under the flag of "neutrality" and "lack of interest in politics" it will hand over the trade unions to the fascist beheaders. The revolutionary trade union opposition should, therefore, concentrate all its attention upon work in the trade unions and defending the trade unions from the penetration of fascists.

Only by these means, only by mobilising every resistance of the mass—in the first case at the factories—can the German Communist Party realise its own slogan of *a mass political strike and preparation for a general strike against fascist dictatorship*, and make this slogan the property of millions and millions of German proletarians in the daily realisation of the militant united front.

The German working class is faced with the greatest danger. But inherent in the German

working class are inexhaustible revolutionary forces. The mighty historic mission which has fallen to the lot of the German Communists to-day, the vanguard of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in the capitalist world, is to raise these revolutionary forces to the surface, and hurl them like a devastating avalanche upon the united forces of bourgeois reaction, frenzied at the presentiment of their rapidly approaching doom.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARX

To P. J. Proudhon, Paris, from Marx,
Engels and Philippe Gigot.

Brussels, 5th May, 1846.

[In the handwriting of Ph. Gigot].

My dear Proudhon,

Since I left Paris, I have often intended writing to you, but circumstances beyond my control have prevented me from doing so up till now. Please believe me when I say that an excess of work, and the inconveniences of a change of domicile have been the only reasons for my silence.

And now let us jump *in medias res*! Conjointly with two of my friends, Frederick Engels and Philippe Gigot (who are both in Brussels), I have organised a permanent correspondence with the German Communists and Socialists. This correspondence is to deal with both the discussion of scientific questions, and the supervision of popular literature, and such Socialist propaganda as can be carried on in Germany by this means. But the chief purpose of our correspondence will be to put the German Socialists in touch with the French and English Socialists, to keep those abroad informed of the trend of Socialist movement in Germany, and to inform the Germans in Germany of the progress of Socialism in France and England. In this way differences of opinion can be brought to light, and an exchange of ideas, together with an impartial criticism, will be achieved. This will be a step forward in the literary expression of the social movement, a step which will help to free it from the limitation of *nationality*. And in times of action, it is undoubtedly most important for everyone to be informed of the state of affairs abroad as well as at home.

Besides the Communists in Germany, our correspondence will include also the German Socialists in Paris and in London. Our relations with England are already established. As for France,

we all think that we can find no better correspondent there than yourself; you know, the English and the Germans have always, up till now, appreciated you better than your own countrymen.

As you see, it is merely a question of starting a regular correspondence, and of providing it with the means of following the social movement in the different countries, of attaining a rich and varied interest, such as the work of a single person could never achieve.

If you agree to our proposition, the cost of sending the letters which will be sent to you, and those which you will send to us, will be borne here, the collections taken in Germany being destined to cover the cost of the correspondence.

The address for you to write to here is that of M. Philippe Gigot, 8 rue de Bodenbroek. He will also sign the letters from Brussels.

I have no need to add that all this correspondence demands absolute secrecy on your part; in Germany our friends have to act with the greatest circumspection, to avoid being compromised.

Reply to us soon and believe in the very sincere friendship of

Your most devoted

KARL MARX.

Brussels, 5th May, 1846.

P.S.—Herewith a denunciation of M. Gruen (now in Paris). This man is a mere literary "chevalier d'industrie,"* a kind of charlatan trafficking in modern ideas. He tries to hide his ignorance beneath pompous and arrogant phrases, but he has succeeded only in making himself ridiculous by his gibberish. Moreover, this man is *dangerous*. He *abuses* the acquaintance he has established, thanks to his impertinence, with well-known authors, to make a pedestal for himself and thus to compromise them in the eyes of the German public. In his book on the "French Socialists," he dares to call himself Proudhon's professor (*Privatdocent*, an academic

* Adventurer, crook.

dignity in Germany), claiming to have revealed to him the important axioms of German science, and making outrageous statements about his works. So beware of this parasite. Perhaps I shall let you know more about this individual later.

(From Gigot) :

I have great pleasure in profiting by the opportunity provided by this letter to assure you how pleased I am to enter into relations with a man as distinguished as yourself. Meanwhile, allow me to call myself

Your very devoted
PHILIPPE GIGOT.

(In Engels' handwriting) :

As for myself, I can only hope that you, M. Proudhon, will approve of the plan we have just proposed to you, and that you will be good enough not to refuse your co-operation. Assuring you of the profound respect for you which your writings have inspired in me, I am

Your very devoted
FREDERICK ENGELS.

Addressed to: Monsieur P. J. Proudhon.

Marx, Engels, Philippe Gigot and Ferdinand Wolf to Gustav Adolf Köttgen in Brussels, 1846, 15th June

Written in F. Wolf's Hand.

Bruxelles, 15th June, 1846.

To G. A. Köttgen to transmit further.

We hasten to make the following reply to your note, forwarded to us a couple of days ago :

We are in complete agreement with your view that the German Communists must emerge from their separation, hitherto existent, and enter into continuous mutual relations; also that Reading and Discussion Circles are urgently needed. For the Communists must first create clarity among themselves, which cannot be sufficiently achieved without regular meetings for discussion of Communist questions. We also fully endorse your view that cheap popular pamphlets and booklets must be distributed. Both the first and the second must be immediately and energetically taken up. You perceive the necessity of stipulating regular monetary contributions. We must, however, reject your proposal to support authors by these, and create them a comfortable living. In our view, the contributions should only be utilised for the printing of cheap Communist leaflets and pamphlets, as well as for covering the cost of the correspondence, inclusive of that sent abroad. It will be necessary to fix a minimum monthly contribution, so that it may be definitely known at

any moment how much is available for the common purpose. It is further necessary that you inform us of the names of the members of your Communist Circle—that one may know, as you do of us, with whom one is dealing. Finally, we await your indication of the amount of the monthly contribution to the common purposes; as the issue of one or two popular pamphlets is to be undertaken as soon as possible. That these pamphlets cannot be published in Germany is obvious, and requires no proofs.

You cherish really extensive illusions as to the "Bundestag" (Federation Congress), the King of Prussia, and the "Landstände" (Gentry). Your memorial can only have any effect when there is a strong and organised Communist Party, neither of which is the case.

A petition is only of value when, at the same time, it is a threat behind which stands a compact and organised mass.

The only thing which you could do, should the circumstances in which you find yourself be favourable, would be to organise an imposing petition, with *numerous* workers' signatures.

We regard a Communist Congress as yet too premature. First, when Communist circles have been organised throughout the whole of Germany, and means of Action collected, can the delegates of the separate Groups meet in a Congress with any prospect of success. This will not be before next year.

Until then the only means of co-operation is by writing and regular correspondence.

Correspondence is already taking place from here with the English and French Communists, from time to time, as well as with the German Communists abroad.

We will inform you whenever we get reports on the Communist movement in England and France and of any other news we glean, by appending to our correspondence when writing you.

We urge you to supply us with a *reliable* address (and do not put the full name on the seal, so that it is immediately known who is the sender as well as the addressee).

Write us at the following *completely reliable* address : Monsieur Ph. Gigot, 8 rue de Bodembroek, Bruxelles.

K. Marx, F. Engels, Ph. Gigot, J. Wolf.

*Weerth sends greetings. He is in Amiens at the moment.

If you carry out your idea with regard to the petition, that will lead to nothing but an open proclamation of its weakness by the Communist Party, and at the same time give the Government the names of the people whom it must specially

* The following in Engels' hand.

watch. If you cannot organise a workers' petition with at least 500 signatures, then rather petition, like the bourgeois in Trier, for a progressive property tax, and should the bourgeoisie reject this also, "eh Bien," then, meantime join in the public demonstrations, act jesuitically, drop the German honesty, trueheartedness and frankness, and sign and circulate the bourgeois petitions for Freedom of the Press, Constitution, etc. If this is achieved, a new era opens for (Communist) propaganda. Our means will be increased and the contradiction between bourgeoisie and proletariat sharpened. In a party one must support everything which will assist it, and not allow tedious moral scruples. Also you must elect a regular committee for the correspondence, which will draft the letters to us, and discuss them and regularly meet. Otherwise the matter will not be orderly. You must elect the one you regard as the most capable for drafting the letters. Personal considerations must be completely excluded, they ruin everything. The names of the committee members should naturally be communicated to us.

SALUT.

At the Fountain-Head of the International Communist Movement

By L. PERCHIK.

FROM the extensive correspondence between Marx and Engels, and the correspondents and emissaries of the "Committee for Communist Correspondence" of the period of 1846, when steps were being taken to form an international Communist revolutionary proletarian party for the first time in history, only two letters—to Proudhon and Köttgen—have come down to us. These two letters throw light on an interesting page from the history of the conception of the Communist vanguard of the working class. They were written by the founders of scientific Communism at the very source of the first international Communist party, known under the title of the "Communist League." *These letters, like all the literature and the political activity of the founders of scientific Communism in the period 1844-46, show us that, even at this time, not only had the fundamentals of the Marxian theory, strategy and tactics been worked out, but also the organisational principles of the structure of the proletarian party.*

The question of the formation of a new revolutionary party was raised by Marx as early as 1845, immediately after the Prussian government had suppressed the "Rheinische Zeitung," of which he had been the editor from October, 1842. In a

letter to Arnold Ruge in September, 1843, Marx wrote:

"Thus no one prevents us from connecting our criticism with the criticism of politics, with the interests of a definite political party, and therefore connecting up and identifying our criticism with the *real* struggle . . . We do not say to the world: Stop struggling. All your struggle is paltry. We only give to it the true slogan of struggle."*

In his historic article, "The Criticism of Hegel's Philosophy of Law," which formed the starting-point of the whole system of materialism and scientific Communism, Marx wrote of the *unity of theory and practice, philosophy and politics*:

"The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, take the place of criticism by weapons. Material forces must be overthrown by material forces. But theory also becomes a material force as soon as it embraces the masses . . . The head of this emancipation (of humanity) is *philosophy* and its heart is the *proletariat*."†

This passage, like the previous quotation from Marx, stresses the unity of theory and practice. The theory of the revolutionary proletariat, worked out by Marx, had to be carried into practice through the proletariat. The active bearers of this advanced theory were to be the conscious vanguard of the advanced class, the proletariat.

In spring, 1844, Marx, leaving Germany, where "even for the sake of freedom it is repulsive to suffer the corvée," and temporarily settling in Paris until his next exile, entered into connection with the "League of the Just," which had been in existence since 1836, and with a number of other workers' organisations. Concerning this, Marx wrote in 1860 in "Herr Vogt" (to appear in Russian for the first time this year, in the series published by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute):

"During my first stay in Paris I kept in personal contact with the leaders of the 'League' and also with the leaders of most of the secret French workers' societies."

In the Prussian state archives the secret reports of the police agents on the extremely active way in which Marx visited meetings of German workers and artisans at this time still exist.

As early as autumn, 1844, when Marx and Engels met in Paris and established a complete unity of views on all the basic questions of theory, they began to carry on practical work for the formation of a party. In a letter to Marx at the beginning of October, 1844, Engels writes:

* Marx and Engels. Collected Works, Vol. I., page 336. Here and throughout, italics in the original, unless specially otherwise indicated.

† Marx and Engels. Collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 206, 412.

"In Cologne I stayed three days and was astonished at the unbelievable success of our propaganda. Our people there are very active, but the lack of a reliable support can be felt . . . I shall write a small pamphlet in which I will show that Communism is a possible matter."*

On March 17th, 1845, Engels wrote:

"Yesterday evening I was with Hess in Elberfeld, where we preached Communism until two o'clock."†

During his journey together with Engels in summer, 1845, to Manchester, England, to study a number of economic questions there, on the spot, both in a theoretical and practical way, Marx got into personal contact with the London "League of the Just," and with William Weitling, who lived in London at the time.

In February, 1846, at the very height of their theoretical work on "German Ideology," Marx and Engels put the question of the development of an international Communist organisation formed on the principles of scientific Communism into practical motion. *The first stage in this matter, in their plans, was to be the "Communist Correspondence Committee."* This organisation played an enormous historic rôle in the history of the proletarian movement. It rallied round Marx and Engels a number of the advanced people of the working class, made professional revolutionists of them, and was the first organisation based on scientifically founded principles of the Marxist teachings on the party as the political vanguard of the proletariat.

In "German Ideology," in the chapter on Feuerbach, there is the following formulation of the tasks of the Communist Party:

"He (Feuerbach) wants . . . like all other theoreticians, to arrive only at a correct understanding of the existing fact, while the task of a real Communist is to overthrow the existing order."‡

We see how the well-known thesis on the philosophy of Feuerbach found its concrete political expression here. It is not a question of philosophers here, but of politicians, or, more accurately, of philosopher-politicians, of practical philosophers, of politicians armed with advanced theory. Only Communists can be such philosophers. A real Communist is he who not only achieves even a just knowledge of reality, but who overthrows and transforms it.

In the same book, in the chapter on "true

socialism," and Karl Grün who led it, whom Marx mentions in his letter to Proudhon, a sharp criticism is given of the petty-bourgeois so-called "true" socialism, this first historic variety of opportunism in the German workers' movement:

"The absence in Germany of a *real*, passionate, practical party of struggle has converted the beginnings even of the socialist movement into a *purely* literary movement. True socialism is a perfect social literary movement arising outside real party interests and wishing to continue to exist at the present time after the formation of the Communist Party and despite it. Naturally, after the rise of a real Communist Party in Germany, 'true socialism' will more and more have to find its audience among the petty bourgeoisie alone, and the representatives of this audience among impotent and vapid litterateurs."*

Marx and Engels set up a correspondence with a series of sympathisers with the new principles, scientific Communism, as early as 1844, with the aim of recruiting them into the Party. In February-March, 1846, the Committee of Communist Correspondence was organised on their initiative, and the correspondence in connection with this considerably increased. Among the large number of people who corresponded with Marx and Engels, and belonged to the Brussels group of Communists, many later formed the basic core of the "Communist League," its old guard. Among them were Daniels from Cologne, Everboche from Paris, Karl Schapper, Heinrich Bauer and Joseph Moll of London, W. Wolf from Silesia, Weydemeyer from Westphalia, etc.

From the letters to Proudhon and Kötting we see that the committee set itself very great tasks. These tasks included all sides of Party activity: propaganda, agitation and organisation, while these not yet reliable recruits to the Party are clearly given to understand that the main aim is the formation of an international Communist organisation, the establishment of permanent contacts between the Communists of various countries.

"Correspondence must deal with the discussion of scientific questions and with the methods of influencing popular literature, and also with socialist propaganda . . . however, the main aim of our correspondence will be to establish contacts between the German socialists and the French and English socialists . . . This is a step towards the social movement freeing itself finally from national limitations."

The fact that the matter in view was not "purely scientific discussion" nor activity separ-

* Marx and Engels. Collected Works, Vol. XXI., pp. 1-3.

† Ibid., page 19.

‡ Marx and Engels. Collected Works, Vol. IV., page 32.

* Marx and Engels. Collected Works, Vol. IV., page 447.

ated from the masses, not platonic contacts "in general," but revolutionary contacts and revolutionary policy, is emphasised with the greatest exactness in the following words:

"At the moment of advance it is, of course, extremely important for everyone to know the state of affairs abroad as thoroughly as in his own country."

Almost simultaneously with the letter to Proudhon, at a meeting of the Brussels Communist group (Marx, Engels, Gigot, Heilberg, Seiler, Weitling, E. von Westphalen and Wolf), a long resolution was adopted almost unanimously, against the one vote of Weitling, concerning the discrediting activity of sentimental "true socialism," the revolutionary phraseology of Krige ("The Manifesto against Krige"). In this manifesto, we also find important remarks on the Party as the *vanguard of the proletariat and the necessity of a struggle against the hostile elements and influences which penetrate it*. "The Manifesto against Krige" is a document on the organisation principles of a proletarian party.

"We are members of a party," says the introduction to the Manifesto, "but we therefore do not intend to lower the party to the level of a clique . . . We know that every principle and every trend becomes all the more strong and invincible the more mercilessly it is liberated from superfluous growths by criticism."*

The working out of the basic principles of party organisation took place very intensively at this period. Thus, in the address written on July 17th, 1846, to the leader of the Chartists, O'Connor, on the occasion of his victory in the election at Nottingham, *Marx and Engels call attention to the necessity of cleansing the proletarian party from foreign elements*:

"The Chartist Party can only win by expelling the hidden bourgeoisie who, parading with the name of Chartist for the sake of popularity, at the same time try to win a position among the middle classes by personal flattery and literary means . . . and propaganda of such base and infamous old women's doctrines as that of 'non-resistance'."†

The vote of Weitling against Marx's resolution at the Brussels group of Communists on Krige was no accident. Weitling, this talented natural worker-genius, in his development had not attained the foremost ranks of the revolutionary proletariat.

"A prophet hounded from one country to another; a seer who had a recipe ready to hand for the realisation of heaven upon earth, and

fancied that everyone was trying to steal it from him. He had already become embroiled with the members of the Federation (League) in London and Brussels. In the latter town Marx and his wife had welcomed Weitling with well-nigh superhuman forbearance. But Weitling could not get on with anyone."*

At one of the first sessions of the Communist Correspondence Committee on March 30th, 1846, P. B. Annenkov, the same Russian to whom Marx and Engels, in their letter of December 28th, 1846, gave a brilliant exposition of their points of difference with Proudhon, was present as a guest. Here is what Annenkov wrote in 1880 in the journal "Herald of Europe" in description of the meeting, Marx himself, and the split which took place between Marx and Weitling:

"Marx was the type of man made of energy, will and an inflexible conviction, a type exceedingly remarkable in his outward appearance also. With a thick black head of hair, with hairy hands, in an overcoat buttoned awry, he had, however (this word 'however' can probably be attributed to the censorship and the readers of the 'Herald of Europe'), the appearance of a man with the right and the power to demand respect, however he seemed to you, and whatever he did. All his movements were awkward, but bold and confident. All his habits were in defiance of accepted conventions, but were proud and somewhat contemptuous, while his strident voice, sounding like metal, was wonderfully in keeping with the radical condemnation of persons and things which it uttered . . . Before me stood the personification of a democratic dictator, as he might be described by the imagination in hours of fancy. The contrast with the types I had so recently left in Russia was most decisive . . .

"The meeting had been called to decide, as far as possible, on a common mode of action between the leaders of the workers' movement . . . We sat at a small green table, at one end of which was Marx, a pencil in his hand and his lionine head bent over a sheet of paper, while his inseparable companion and comrade in propaganda, Engels, tall and with English pomposity and solemnity, opened the meeting with a speech . . . Weitling, evidently, wanted to keep the meeting on the lines of general liberal declarations."

The meeting, as described by Annenkov, ended by Marx leaping from his place in reply to a demagogic attack of Weitling, with his cabinet

* Marx and Engels. Collected Works, Vol. V., page 9.

† Marx and Engels. Collected Works, Vol. V.

* Engels. "History of the Communist League." Quoted in full by Ryazanoff in "Communist Manifesto."

learning, and exclaiming, "Ignorance never helped anyone."*

The letters to Proudhon and Kottgen deserve attention in one other respect. The struggle of Marx and Engels on two fronts can be clearly seen in these letters. It is, of course, a mere chance that the two letters which have been preserved were addressed, it may be said, to the representatives of two distinct opportunist tendencies. But, thanks to this chance, the letters assume exceptional interest, due to the way in which the authors gave prominence to the question of the struggle against opportunism in each of them.

In the letter to the Right-winger, Proudhon, Marx and Engels emphasise the necessity of establishing international contacts and carrying on agitation, to be ready for *action for revolution*. In the letter to the "left" phrasemonger, Kottgen, Marx and Engels emphasise the necessity of a *preliminary gathering of forces, before assuming the offensive*.

In these letters most prominence is ascribed to questions of Party structure. It is necessary to put an end to scattering of forces, and to establish systematic and permanent contacts, to develop propagandist work to its fullest extent (lectures, debates). "For the Communists must, first, create clarity among themselves." From propaganda it is necessary to proceed more and more to agitation, however difficult the conditions for it, and "cheap, popular Communist pamphlets must be distributed."

A strong, firmly welded, conscientious and disciplined party organisation is necessary, and every member of the organisation must take a real part in Party work and regularly pay dues, supporting the Party with monetary aid.

"However, we reject your proposal to support authors by these (membership dues) and create for them a comfortable living" (letter to Kottgen).

Thus even at that time in the Party organisation there was to be noted a tendency among the petty-bourgeoisie fellow-travellers to utilise the Party in their own interests, which was most energetically resisted by Marx and Engels.

Further, an estimate of the tactics of Kottgen on the question of petitions is given:

"A petition is only of value when, at the same time, it is a threat, behind which stands a compact and organised mass."

On the eve of the 1905 revolution, the Russian Mensheviks imitated the tactics of Kottgen on the question of petitions, for which Lenin flayed them mercilessly.

"Drop the German honesty," are the instructions of Marx and Engels to Kottgen, "true-

heartedness and frankness . . . In a Party one must support everything which will assist it, and not allow tedious moral scruples."

And in the same place, in a few words, he gives a brilliant outline of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

"Also you must elect a regular committee for the correspondence . . . Personal considerations must be completely excluded. They ruin everything."

In this way was built up the first Communist organisation.

The reply of Proudhon to Marx is very interesting. In the letter of May 17th, 1846, Proudhon states that he willingly agrees to become one of the participators in the correspondence, the aim and organisation of which seems to him to be very useful. However, Proudhon does not altogether agree with the letter of Marx, or rather he completely disagrees with it. "I make so bold," writes Proudhon, "as to make some provisions which several places in your letter call from me."

Firstly, Proudhon was against the Party. He was against the domination of any theory whatever in the movement. The ideologist of petty-bourgeois socialism, he favoured the spontaneity of the movement and was against the party, against the leadership of the movement by a conscious vanguard.

"For God's sake," writes Proudhon, now that you have disarmed all the old bigots, don't let us think in turn of teaching the people . . . We will carry on a good honest polemic. Let us give to the world an example of wise and foresighted tolerance, and let us not become leaders of a new intolerance. Let us not come out as the apostles of a new religion, even though it be the religion of logic and wisdom."

Secondly, Proudhon was against the revolution.

"I think," he writes, "that we do not need revolution to secure success . . . I prefer to burn property on a slow fire rather than give it new power, by arranging a new Bartholomew's Night of property owners."

The present day social-democrats could sign their names to every phrase of the reply of Proudhon to Marx. They, like Proudhon, are against revolution and against the Party as the vanguard of the proletariat, guided by revolutionary theory. The only difference is that Proudhon honestly and openly expressed his convictions to Marx, while the present day social-opportunists come out under the smoke-screen of "Marxist" phraseology, throw dust in the eyes of the workers, and contemptuously emasculate Marxism of all its revolutionary contents.

* "Herald of Europe," 1880, Vol. IV., page 487-8.

We find a very interesting reminder of this fascinating period of the transition from theoretical research to organisational action in the article by Engels, "The History of the Communist League," written in 1885, two years after the death of Marx:

"We had no wish to propound these new scientific conclusions in ponderous tomes for the edification of professional wiseacres. Quite otherwise. We had both of us entered, bag and baggage, into the political movement, we had certain connections with the educated world (especially in the western provinces of Germany), and had close ties with the organised proletariat. In duty bound, we had to place our outlook upon a firm scientific foundation. But it was no less incumbent upon us to win over the European proletariat in general and the German proletariat in particular to our convictions . . . By word of mouth, by letters, through the newspapers, we pressed our theoretical outlook upon the notice of the members. In addition we issued lithographed circulars on special occasions (as, for instance, in connection with the internal affairs of the Communist Party now in process of formation) and posted these to our friends and correspondents the world over."

The lithographed circular, "The Manifesto against Krige" was one of these directive letters of the Communist centre, headed by Marx and Engels. Just as the emissaries and correspondents of the Communist Correspondence Committee were the prototype of the organisation of

professional revolutionaries, the Bolshevik Leninist Party, so these lithographed circulars and letters were the prototype of the Leninist "Iskra." Just as Lenin, half a century later, advanced, as the basic immediate task of the Party the foundation of a single social-democratic paper for all Russia, which would be not only a collective propagandist and agitator but also an organiser, so Marx and Engels made it their immediate task, at that time, to form a united printed organ, which would form the beginning of the uniting of all the Communist forces of the most advanced countries of Europe, above all, Germany.

The Marxian theory of the Party, like the party which was guided by Marx — the Communist League — was built up in a determined struggle on two fronts. This theory remained a sealed book for opportunists, both of the Right and the "left" persuasion. The only heir and continuer of the principles of Marx in the theory of the Party, in the principles and art of Party construction, is the Bolshevik Party which bears on high the revolutionary banner of Marx and Engels. Lenin developed and raised the Marxian teachings on the Party to a tremendous height as adapted to the new epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, relying on the whole of the enormous political experience of the international proletarian movement.

The Comintern, this world Communist Party and its leading section the C.P.S.U.(b), headed by the leader of the world proletariat, Comrade Stalin, is the embodiment of the Marxian theory of the Party as the vanguard of the working class.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE WAR OF JAPAN IN CHINA

L. MADYAR.

THE League of Nations "solved" the Manchurian problem, and after the decision of the League of Nations—the Japanese troops began their advance on Jehol. This is the best illustration of the value of the decisions of the League of Nations. It would not have been necessary to deal with the discussion of the Far Eastern problem at the League of Nations, if the Geneva discussion and the decisions of the "Committee of 19" had not reflected, as in a brooked mirror, those changes taking place recently in the whole international situation. In reality, the decisions of the "Committee of 19" on the Manchurian question are not worth the paper they are written on. This scrap of paper has already been torn to shreds and ground under the heel of the Japanese general's jackboot in the

thunder of the Japanese guns in Jehol. The occupation of the chief town of Jehol—Chende—by the Japanese troops shows the political worth of the Geneva decisions sufficiently clearly and plainly. The political value of these decisions was all the more negligible in so far as the "Committee of 19" did not propose any sanctions against the country violating the decisions of the League of Nations, and it is quite clear that the "moral authority" of the League of Nations will not stop Japanese imperialism, will not restore the sovereignty of China and Manchuria, not even having the effect of one blank shot.

But possibly the decision of the "Committee of 19" is nevertheless a moral victory from the point of view of peace? Possibly the League of Nations, nevertheless, adopted a decision in

favour of peace, against imperialist aggression? Possibly the League of Nations came forward at least once in favour of the territorial integrity and independence of semi-colonial China against imperialist Japan? Possibly the decisions of the "Committee of 19" refute the contention that the League of Nations is an instrument of war?

It is sufficient to examine the real contents of the decisions of the "Committee of 19" to be convinced that the League of Nations has not changed its policy, that, in making these decisions, the League of Nations continues the policy of imperialist aggression in the Far East, the policy of strangling China, though complicated by the antagonisms of the imperialists, pregnant with imperialist military conflicts. In making these decisions, the League of Nations confirms that it is not an instrument of peace—but of war.

* * *

What is the essence of the decision of the "Commission of 19"? For the moment we are speaking of the proposals of the "Commission of 19," appointed by the League of Nations to examine the Manchurian question.

The "Commission of 19" based its decisions on the report of the Lytton Commission. It admitted that the Japanese troops, in occupying Manchuria, did not act in self-defence. It admitted that the so-called new state, named Manchuko by the Japanese imperialists, was created by Japanese imperialism, and was not the free expression of the will of the population of Manchuria. It proposed to the Powers not to recognise this "new state" of Manchuko, established by Japanese bayonets. In the spirit of the Lytton report, it proposed the restoration of Chinese supremacy over Manchuria. It proposed the formation of a conciliation board for the encouragement and institution of direct negotiations between China and Japan. To solve the question of the fate of Manchuria, the "Commission of 19" proposes the nine proposals of the Lytton Commission as a basis of negotiation.

What is hidden behind these decisions of the "Committee of 19" and what is the real and not the formal nature of these decisions? We know that the Lytton Commission proposed to restore formal sovereignty over Manchuria, but at the same time the commission proposed the conversion of Manchuria into a colony of international imperialism. *Politically* Manchuria must become a colony of international imperialism, receiving the widest "autonomy," submitting to an international *gendarmerie*, and the foreign powers, including Japan, in the administration of this "autonomous" region to be represented through counsellors. *Economically*, according to the proposal of the Lytton Commission, it must

become a colony of Japanese imperialism, on condition that the economic interests of other powers are maintained. Japanese capital must receive all the commanding heights of Manchuria, it must receive the right of buying land, it must receive the right to forest, mining and other concessions. The Chinese railways must be united with the South Manchurian Railway and subordinated to it. At the same time, the Lytton Commission requires all China to make a new commercial agreement with Japan to extend economic contacts between Japan and China, i.e., the commission proposes the further economic enslavement of all China to Japanese capital, calculating, that on the basis of the "most favoured nation" clause, all the remaining imperialist powers must receive the same rights as Japan.

We know also that the Lytton Commission indicated the growing danger of the Soviet revolution in China, and its enormous victories, and proposed "temporary international collaboration for the restoration of China," i.e., international intervention against the Chinese revolution, the crushing of the Soviet revolution in China, and the extension of Nanking Government power throughout China, under the control of international imperialism.

We have already pointed out that these proposals of the Lytton Commission convert Manchuria, politically, into a colony of international imperialism, and economically, one of Japanese imperialism, strengthening, at the same time, the economic position of international imperialism throughout China, subjecting all China to the political control of international imperialism, and thus converting all China, and above all, Manchuria, into a springboard for intervention in the U.S.S.R.

When the "Commission of 19" took the proposals of the Lytton Commission as its basis, it pronounced itself in favour of the realisation of this plan. Thus, the matter under discussion is by no means peace—but, on the contrary, war. It is not the preservation of the territorial integrity of China, but, on the contrary, the further subjection of all China to international imperialism. In taking the recommendation of the Lytton Commission as the basis of its decisions, the "Commission of 19" acted specifically as an instrument of war.

* * *

How was it, nevertheless, that Japanese imperialism did not accept the decisions of the "Commission of 19," protested against them, refused to submit to them, and threatened to leave the League of Nations? (Probably it will

carry out its threat sooner or later.)* This peculiar situation arose because the League of Nations is an instrument for carrying out the general policy of the imperialists, under the leadership of French and British imperialism, and within the framework of this the general interests of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R., against the colonial peoples, against the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the oppressed colonial peoples in general.

In proportion as antagonisms sharpen in the camp of the imperialists, it is more and more difficult to satisfy the interests of individual imperialist powers within these general limits. Japanese imperialism did not accept the decisions of the League of Nations because these decisions, in the whole, protect the interests of British and French imperialism, and do not correspond to the maximum programme of Japanese imperialism. After the occupation of Manchuria by the Japanese troops, the League of Nations, on the whole, supported the Japanese, encouraging the seizure of Manchuria, and all the measures of the League were directed to easing the actions of Japanese imperialism, to concealing these actions, to supporting the Japanese annexation. This policy of the League of Nations arose from the fact that the League is entirely under the leadership of British and French imperialism. As French imperialism has a military alliance with Japanese imperialism in reality, as British imperialism supports Japanese imperialism with the aim of winning Japan to the side of British imperialism in the struggle of Great Britain against American imperialism, as the policy of the British Conservatives is directed to restoring the Anglo-Japanese alliance against the U.S.A. and against the U.S.S.R. on new lines, therefore the League of Nations supported Japanese imperialism in a hardly concealed form. If the decisions of the "Commission of 10" do not fully satisfy the interests of Japan, this circumstance is explained by the fact that certain changes have taken place in the policy of British and French imperialism in Geneva. If we examine these changes, we shall get the key to an understanding of the position of British and French imperialism in Geneva, the key to a real understanding of the decisions of the "Committee of 10" as the result of the conflict of imperialist interests.

* * *

What changes took place in the policy of British imperialism? How can we explain the policy of British imperialism?

Japanese imperialism concentrates troops for the seizure of the province of Jehol. Japanese

imperialism declares Jehol a component part of the new state "Manchuko," and at the same time, Japanese militarists threaten to seize a number of the provinces of Northern China, especially the seizure of Peiping and Tientsin. We also know that the agents of the Japanese general staff are already carrying on intensive work in the provinces of Chakhar and Suyuan, organising the arming of the Mongolian princes, organising the Buddhist monasteries and preparing for the transfer of power into the hands of direct agents of Japanese imperialism. At the same time, in Peiping and Tientsin, with the support of Japanese imperialism, groups of Chinese generals are being organised under Kuomintang labels for the purpose of overthrowing Chang Hsueh-liang, for driving Chang Hsueh-liang out of Northern China, for Japanese imperialism regards Chang Hsueh-liang as an agent of American imperialism, and uses every effort to remove him from Northern China. It is well known that General Hang Fu-yun, in the province of Shantung, and the Yen Si-chang and Feng Yu-siang groups in the provinces of Shensi and Shansi, are only waiting for a suitable moment to begin war against Chang Hsueh-liang in Peiping and Tientsin. The pro-Japanese Anfu group, headed by Dwang Tsi-ju, is also preparing a rising with the aim of driving out Chang Hsueh-liang.

All these manoeuvres are directed to forming a sort of covering screen for Manchuria from Tientsin to Taoyan, to convert this part of China also into a sphere of influence of Japanese imperialism. However, on these territories British imperialism also has big interests. British imperialism, while supporting the annexation of Manchuria by Japanese troops, is, at the same time, not interested in Japanese imperialism becoming extremely strong in Northern China, the more so as British imperialism regards Peiping and Tientsin as its own sphere of influence. Therefore, British imperialism is following the operations of the Japanese troops in Northern China closely.

Secondly, there is no doubt that the competitive war of Japanese textiles in India, Malaya, East Africa and all the near East, including Irak and Egypt, against British textiles, has squeezed British textiles out of the Far Eastern, Near Eastern and African markets, increasing the amount of Japanese dumping to such an extent, that the caution of British imperialism has increased, as well as the antagonisms which really exist between British and Japanese imperialism.

But this is not all. British policy, on the whole, has been directed to winning Japan over to its side as an ally in the struggle against

* As everybody knows, the author's prophecy has now been substantiated.—Ed.

American imperialism. British imperialism is striving to restore its alliance with Japan, which was abandoned only under the pressure of the U.S.A. at the Washington Conference in 1922. Until the advance into Manchuria by Japanese imperialism, Japan occupied a very favourable position in the struggle between the U.S.A. and Great Britain, as both the U.S.A. and Great Britain were trying to win the support of Japanese imperialism in the Far East. After the advance of Japanese imperialism into China, the mutual relations between Japanese and American imperialism became so strained that both the U.S.A. and Japan have been compelled to carry on a struggle for the support of Britain. It is quite clear that the real antagonisms between the British and American imperialisms are so acute that an agreement between British and American imperialisms is, in the long run, impossible. The tendency of development lies precisely in a rapprochement between British and Japanese imperialism, against the imperialism of the U.S.A.

Recently the foreign policy of the U.S.A. has been directed to disorganising and upsetting the bloc which was intended between Britain, France and Japan, directed also against the interests of the U.S.A. British imperialism made use of this position. Negotiations are to take place between the U.S.A. and Great Britain on the question of inter-allied war debts, the restoration of the gold basis for the English pound, the redistribution of gold, the decisions of the Ottawa conference, and all the questions on the agenda of the world economic conference.

As we know, these negotiations commence in March, when the new President, Roosevelt, comes into office. It is absolutely obvious that not only economic questions will be raised, but all the central questions of international politics, including the Pacific problem, the Manchurian problem and the Chinese problem as a whole.

British imperialism is interested in retaining a certain freedom of action during these negotiations, so as to have "small change" to offer in payment for the concessions which it intends to wrest from the U.S.A. It seems to us that the British Government was guided in its policy at Geneva precisely by these reasons. It wanted to preserve at least the appearance of the possibility of making certain concessions to the U.S.A. on the Manchurian question. Hence the gesture of the British Government at Geneva. Therefore, the British Government agreed, in the "Commission of 19," to a proposal which does not completely satisfy the interests of Japanese imperialism. Hence the gesture of the British Government regarding the prohibition of the

export of arms to the Far East. In reality this prohibition was directed against China and not against Japan, but, nevertheless, all these gestures are directed towards creating favourable grounds for negotiations between Britain and the U.S.A.

* * *

What considerations influenced French imperialism?

There is no doubt that recently a bigger change has taken place in the position of French imperialism than in the position of British imperialism. The advent of Hitler to power in Germany undoubtedly introduced new factors into the international situation on the whole European continent. French imperialism takes account of these changes. French imperialism reckons on the fact that the Germany of Hitler will seek an alliance with the Italy of Mussolini. French imperialism must reckon on the fact that the Hungary of Horthy, according to all signs, has already concluded a military and political alliance with Italian fascism. French imperialism must reckon on the fact that a very far-reaching rapprochement and collaboration has taken place between fascist Germany and fascist Hungary. Paris must take account of the fact that the Austria of Dollfuss is evidently also endeavouring to enter the German-Hungarian-Italian bloc. The transport of munitions from Italy through Austria to Hungary has already shown how close is the collaboration established between Austria and Italy, and Austria and Hungary. There is no doubt that one of the chief features in the whole international situation in Europe is that there is taking place at an accelerated pace at the present time the formation and building up of a bloc of the so-called anti-Versailles countries, i.e., the imperialist countries which are opposing the Versailles partition of the world, which are trying to change the Versailles partition of the world in their own favour, which are striving for the repartition of the world.

French imperialism is exerting every effort to build up a still stronger bloc of Versailles powers, i.e., a bloc of those imperialist powers which are interested in the preservation of the Versailles partition of the world. The rapprochement between Germany, Hungary, Italy and Austria is already an accomplished fact, and French imperialism is taking its counter-measures. The attempt at a compact between French imperialism and Italian fascism has so far not produced any results. The new special Ambassador of France in Rome, de Juvenal, has undertaken the task of solving Franco-Italian contradictions in North Africa, in the Balkans, in the Danube Valley and in the Near East, on the question of naval and

military armaments, with the aim of isolating German imperialism. However, these attempts have so far met with no success. On the contrary, the Franco-Italian contradictions have sharpened tremendously, and the conflict between Anglo-Slavia and Italy is merely one of the forms in which the sharpening of Franco-Italian antagonisms appear.

French imperialism replies to the formation of the planned anti-French bloc by strengthening military and political alliances. The "reorganisation of the Little Entente," the still closer collaboration between Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania and Jugo-Slavia, the signing of a new treaty between these countries, the signing of a whole series of new military agreements between these countries, is only part of the reply of French imperialism to the formation of the anti-Versailles bloc.

The joint protest of the British and French governments against the transport of arms through Austria and Italy to Hungary was calculated on demonstrating Anglo-French collaboration against attempts at the revision of the Versailles treaty. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the "confidence pact" between Britain and France at Lausanne was a big step towards restoring the Anglo-French entente on a new basis. The conduct of the British press regarding the provocation of the German fascists, the hostile attitude of the Conservative press to German fascism, shows that very close collaboration has been established between France and Great Britain, but evidently the more far-sighted representatives of French imperialism consider that these forces are still insufficient. In Paris it is evidently thought that the U.S.A. may take advantage of the splitting of imperialist Europe into two camps, that the U.S.A. may pronounce on the side of the anti-Versailles bloc. Though the very recent attempt of the U.S.A. to approach nearer to France—to upset the Anglo-French-Japanese bloc met with a cold reception from France—at the present time there is no doubt that a certain change has taken place in France in this respect. In Paris the necessity of a compact with the U.S.A., in face of the dangers which threaten Europe, is spoken of more and more often.

French imperialism evidently is trying to neutralise the U.S.A. in the struggle developing around the Versailles system in Europe. Hence the gesture of France at Geneva, hence the agreement of France to the decision of the "Commission of 19," and hence the speeches of Herriot and other French politicians for an agreement with the U.S.A. The problem of war debts plays only a secondary rôle in this respect. Here the

matter in question is a much bigger problem—the Versailles partition of the world as a whole.

* * *

The position of France and Britain was determined to a considerable extent by the events in Germany. The coming of Hitler to power caused a strong echo in France and Great Britain, for in France and in Great Britain account is taken of the fact that the present German Government is a government of the concentration of all the contradictions which rend the German bourgeoisie on the question of foreign policy. The Hitlerite National Socialists are taking the line of an alliance with Italy. Papen and his group still maintain an orientation on an agreement with France. Hugenburg and the German Nationalists hope for an agreement with Great Britain. A component part of the calculations of the fascist government is the formation of an anti-Soviet bloc with the participation of Germany. On the other hand, all the groups of German fascism have to reckon with a tremendous sharpening of Franco-German and German-Polish relations in the immediate future. The anti-Soviet speeches of Hitler and Goering do not only arise out of the struggle against Communism. They show that German fascism would not be against entering into a temporary compromise with French imperialism on certain conditions, but at the same time German fascism is faced with the problem of Versailles, with the hostility of French imperialism, with the hostility of British imperialism to German imperialism. These contradictions have not been solved in the camp of German fascism and it is hardly likely that they can be solved by internal compromises. The problem of reparations was not finally solved in the Lausanne agreement. If there is no agreement between Britain and France on the one hand, and the U.S.A. on the other, on the question of international and war debts, the question of reparations will rise in its fullest measure.

With the coming of Hitler to power, relations at the Geneva disarmament conference sharpened more than ever. The Five-Power agreement, according to which the aim of the conference is to carry out the principle of equality and safety of all powers, rings with bitter irony at the present time. French imperialism did not intend to give equality to the Germany of Schleicher, and still less does it intend to give equality in armaments to the Germany of Hitler. The crisis of the disarmament conference is coming nearer to its climax. Here also a split is approaching.

* * *

Japanese imperialism did not accept the decisions of the "Commission of 19" and has no intention of accepting them. The reply of

Japanese imperialism to the decisions of the League of Nations was the advance on Jehol. The Japanese advance on Jehol hardly encountered any resistance. The Nanking Government repeatedly announced its intention of offering "armed resistance" to the seizure of Jehol by Japanese troops, that it would carry on a "national war," that it would defend every inch of Chinese land. As representative of the Nanking Government, the minister Sun Dzin-wei went to Peiping, where he held big patriotic meetings. He even threw some financial aid to Chang Hsueh-liang and the governor of the province of Jehol, Tang Yu-lin, ostensibly for the organisation of defence. When the Japanese advance commenced, it became quite clear that Tang Yu-lin was a paid agent of Japanese imperialism, who had remained at his post; and not openly gone over to the side of Manchuko merely for the purpose of breaking down the defence at the critical moment. When the Japanese advance commenced, it turned out that Chang Hsueh-liang did not dream of risking his divisions and weakening himself in military respects compared with Feng Yu-siang, Yen Hsi-shan and Han Fu-dzi, that he did not intend to fight the Japanese imperialists. The national war against Japanese imperialism became a tragi-comic farce on the part of the cliques of Kuomintang generals. Chinese counter-revolution once more showed that it is incapable of defending the country. Nanking has shown once more that it is a govern-

ment of national shame, national treachery. The Kuomintang has shown once more that the counter-revolutionary bloc of the Chinese bourgeoisie with the Chinese landlords is only prepared to fight against the Chinese people.

* * *

It is along these general lines that we should review the policy of the League of Nations on the Manchurian question. This policy signifies the beginning of a new re-grouping of powers. It means that the British and French imperialists at the present moment do not want to close the path to negotiations with the U.S.A. It signifies that the re-grouping of imperialist powers of Europe is having a reverse influence on the situation in the Far East. It shows that the U.S.A. is trying to utilise the situation which has arisen in Europe in its own imperialist interests in the Far East. The Geneva decisions only reflect a new zone in the sharpening of imperialist antagonisms, a new and big step towards the transition to a new cycle of imperialist conflicts.

At the same time, the Geneva decisions bring to light the deep crisis in the League of Nations itself. Japan is already threatening to leave the League of Nations. It is very probable that the Germany of Hitler will prepare a similar step.

Imperialist antagonisms have become so acute that they are destroying and will finally destroy the League of Nations.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN INDIA

(Conclusion)

WORK IN THE TRADE UNIONS.

The activity of the working masses is shown at the present time in the development of the strike movement, and the spontaneous growth of the opposition in the reformist trade unions led by the Joshi-Giri-Shiva Rao group.

The "left" national reformists, especially the group of Kandalkar-V. N. Joshi and Co., are trying, partly using mass forms of struggle, to get at the head of strikes and the growing opposition. In a number of places (Bombay, etc.) they have had some success.

The struggle of the Communists for the masses always and in all conditions presupposes an energetic *every day* participation in the economic struggle of the working masses, in the organisation of mass trade unions, factory committees, and not only participation, but especially the preparation and organisation of the struggles of the working class.

This in turn presupposes the *initiative* of Communists in the organisation of the economic struggle of the working masses, and every-day work among the rank and file. It presupposes the participation of Communists in all the actions of the workers also in places where they take place under the leadership of the national reformists.

In the sphere of the trade union movement is repeated the same mistake, on the whole, which the Communists made in respect to the anti-imperialist movement. The mistake consists in the fact that the Indian Communists consider the treacherous leaders of the reformist, and national-reformist trade unions, and the rank and file workers who follow them, equivalent. The Communists forget that the task is to win over these working masses to the side of Communism.

For many workers, entering a trade union is the first step in their class development. On

entering a trade union, a worker puts forward the task of defending his everyday elementary interests. The trade union is a wide organisation of the proletariat which accepts not only the advanced workers but also the backward strata of the proletariat. Therefore the trade union is an important connecting belt to the broad masses of the proletariat.

The task of Communists consists in participating in all trade unions (including the reformist unions), by their everyday work winning the confidence of the working masses, raising their class-consciousness and carrying them with us, isolating and exposing the reformist leaders. The Indian Communists must realise this.

Many Indian Communists identify the trade unions and the political parties. This, to some extent, is explained by the history of the labour movement in India. The first mass Red trade union in India—the Bombay Girni Kamgar—was formed before the rise of the political party of the working class. In the course of events it stood at the head of the political actions of the Bombay workers in 1928-1930. As the result, it happened that the splits in the labour movement were transferred to the trade unions mechanically. The Communists forgot the distinction between party and trade union, and therefore succumbed to the provocation of the national reformists with exceptional ease, who successfully carried on the policy of splitting in the trade union movement (Bombay, Calcutta). The national reformists, taking advantage of the mistaken position of the Communists, were able to split the trade unions, and the Congress of trade unions in Calcutta, hiding behind phrases on unity.

The task of the Communists was, and is, to hinder the policy of splits carried on by the reformists and national-reformists, establishing a united front also with the lower organisation of the reformist trade unions, to be always and everywhere with the workers, fighting for the carrying out of the unity of the workers' ranks and exposing the reformist, splitting, anti-worker policy of the national-reformists. This is the duty of the Communist Party, but the Indian Communists have not yet learned this.

The practice of the trade union movement and the strike struggle shows a number of serious shortcomings in the work of the Indian Communists, shortcomings which are also explained by the relics of the past. In previous years, strikes usually arose spontaneously. After the beginning of a strike, the reformists usually appeared—lawyers, intellectuals without any definite profession, young business men from the National Congress, etc., assuming the pose of defenders of

the "poor workers," acting as lawyers and intermediaries and taking upon themselves the task of negotiating with the employers. By disorganising the workers' ranks, they hindered the formation of mass trade unions in every way. These "leaders" of the workers took the line of forming trade unions for the *leaders*, occupying leading posts in several unions at once (presidents, secretaries, etc.).

These traditions were seized on by the national-reformists. But these traditions were partially absorbed also by the revolutionary trade union movement, aiding the separation into leaders—and the patronised masses, disbelief in the forces of the proletariat, and failure to understand the mass trade union movement.

Such traditions of "representation" were also fostered by the fact that those who arrived on the scene first, after the beginning of a strike usually became the leaders, beyond all competition, so to say. The others did not interfere. These traditions have not yet been completely uprooted in the revolutionary trade union movement. This is partly explained by the fact that the revolutionary wing up to the present has not begun an energetic struggle for those workers who follow the reformists. Recently in Bombay, for example, there has been a series of big strikes, and the Communists have remained on one side. By this manoeuvre the Communists have isolated themselves from the mass open meetings of the workers organised by the reformists, instead of developing their agitation among the workers on the spot.

All this only assists the national-reformists to strengthen their influence and to split the ranks of the proletariat, hiding behind phrases on "unity."

However, it is precisely at the present time, when the opposition in the reformist trade unions is growing, when the strike wave is rising, when the strivings towards mass organisation are extending, and the workers are leaving the National Congress, that the task of the Communists is to develop the tactic of the united front in the most determined manner, rallying the working class ranks, carrying on joint actions and forming the organs of the united front from below. Hence follows the obligatory task of energetically participating in all strikes, and in those reformist trade unions which lead masses of workers. In India, the majority of the proletariat is not organised, mass trade unions are few, and unions of the leaders are many. Therefore the task is different in every case. Therefore it is necessary to take the concrete circumstances into account on each occasion. It should be considered a serious mistake that in those places where there are mass national-reformist and reformist trade

unions, the Communists have taken the line of self-isolation from work in these unions.

The exposure of the national-reformist leaders presupposes the most energetic everyday work among the rank and file, among the working masses, especially in the factories, who follow the reformists.

The same should be done with still greater insistence and stubbornness during strikes led by the reformists. The tactics of passivity and isolation from such strikes would be criminal shortsightedness, which plays into the hands of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. The open letter of the three Communist Parties raises all these questions sharply, simultaneously stressing the task of forming mass Red trade unions, factory committees and the promotion of worker functionaries.

* * *

The attitude of the Communist groups towards the mass anti-imperialist movement, and mass national-reformist trade unions shows a serious danger which exists in the Communist movement. This is the danger of sectarian self-isolation, conversion into small propagandist groups, without vitality, isolated from the masses, incapable of rousing and leading the working masses to the struggle for their liberation. The danger is that the correct policy of forming an independent Communist Party, the conversion of the proletariat into an independent class force, raising and solving every question from the point of view of the interests of the struggle for socialism, will be *contrasted* (by some Indian Communists) to the task of the struggle for the masses, the struggle for the rallying of its allies (the peasants, the poor of the towns), the struggle for the liberation of the petty-bourgeoisie of the towns and villages from the influence of the bourgeoisie, the attraction of all revolutionary democratic elements to the struggle against the enemies of the people. Hence, in such circumstances, we find such mistakes as the identification of the leaders of the National Congress and the masses who follow them, neglecting the work in the reformist trade unions, the split at Calcutta, self-isolation from strikes led by the national-reformists, repudiation of relations with the revolutionary students, etc.

A danger of the opposite kind is the fact that some Communists, acting against sectarian mistakes, sometimes slip into a position which, in practice, leads to a denial, a smoothing over of the struggle for the separation of the working class as a separate force, the undermining of the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat in the movement of the people as a whole. Such a right opportunist position leads to the softening down of the criticism and the exposure of "left" national reformism, a glossing over of the class

character of the National Congress, an under-estimation of the growth of the class-consciousness of the proletariat and the strength of the workers' activists, etc.

And, moreover, only by fighting against these two mistaken positions is it possible to achieve the formation of a mass Communist Party and expose the "left" national-reformists, including the group of Roy.

The Roy group is trying to utilise separate mistakes of the Communists so that, while slanderously accusing the Comintern of "ultra radicalism," it can hinder the formation of a Communist Party, keep the working class in the position of an appendage of the reformist, treacherous Indian bourgeoisie, and disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses for independence, land and bread.

THE RELATIONS OF THE INDIAN COMMUNISTS TO THE PETTY BOURGEOISIE.

The practice of the last year and a half has shown that there is a great deal which is unclear and mistaken in the policy of the Indian Communists with regard to the broad strata of the petty bourgeoisie of the towns. As late as 1927, and even in 1928, there was an opinion among many of the revolutionaries that the National Congress is a petty bourgeois organisation, led by petty bourgeois leaders and following Gandhi's philosophy, which they claimed was petty bourgeois ideology. This point of view was mistaken, and the whole experience of the class struggle has clearly shown that the National Congress is a bourgeois organisation. But in 1930, when the Communists split with the national-reformists and formed themselves into an independent movement carrying on a struggle against the bourgeois National Congress, in practice, however, they acted both against the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, regarding them as identical. This was a gross mistake.

Hence followed the position, according to which, in practice, no distinction was made between the bourgeois leaders of the National Congress and the rank and file followers who were deceived by it (students, small handicraftsmen, the poor, the workers, etc.), and the task of liberating the revolutionary elements of the petty bourgeois who were prepared to fight against British imperialism from the influence of the bourgeoisie was not raised. The task of forming a common front of the toiling masses (including the poor of the towns) under the hegemony of the proletariat for a struggle for "independence, land and bread" was not raised.

The Communist Parties of China, Great Britain and Germany, in their open letter to the Indian Communists, opposed a series of mistaken views,

such as : (1) the statement that in 1930 the working class followed the petty bourgeoisie, a statement which, in practice, glosses over the bourgeois character of the National Congress and the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie for the leadership of the masses of the people ; (2) the underestimation of "left" national-reformism and the replacement of an exposure of its policy and manoeuvres by a struggle against individual persons ; (3) the mistaken proposal to fuse the C.P. with the revolutionary petty-bourgeois parties, etc. ; simultaneously the letter correctly points out, in connection with the position of the revolutionary wing to the trade union Congress split in Calcutta that :—

"It is also necessary to distinguish the revolutionary patriotism of the toiling masses who are suffering from national oppression, from the treacherous counter-revolutionary pseudo-patriotism of the bourgeoisie. We must learn to prove that the section of the trade union congress which followed Bose, Kandalkar, Roy and Co., is carrying on a struggle against the real patriotism of the revolutionary people. Anyone who separates the class interests of the proletariat from the struggle for independence *in practice* drives the toiling masses and the revolutionary strata of the petty-bourgeoisie into the embraces of the National Congress and its "left" wing, strengthens the position of the bourgeoisie, instead of leading the toiling masses with him and fighting for the hegemony of the proletariat."

A number of factors show that many Indian Communists have not realised this. The C.P. of India correctly pointed out the difference *in principle* between the Communist Party and all the revolutionary petty-bourgeois groups, including the terrorist groups. But is it right to class these groups which carry on a struggle against imperialism, in any case, as being equivalent to the reformist treacherous bourgeois National Congress? No, it is not correct. However, a leaflet of the Calcutta committee of the Communist Party says :—

"The Parties of struggle and revolvers are also the parties of the parasites. These parties (Hindustani, the Socialist Party, Samayarak) have strengthened owing to the secret help of the native parasite classes, and carry out their orders. They do not fight for the liberation of the workers and peasants from exploitation."

An ideological struggle against the terrorists, criticism of their programme, explanation of their class essence (some terrorist groups consist of representatives of small ruined landlords, etc.), which Communists must *always* carry on, will only be successful when the Communists take into consideration the distinction between these groups

and the bourgeois National Congress, and set themselves the task of isolating the bourgeoisie, and winning all the revolutionary elements who are prepared to struggle against imperialism to the side of the Communist Party.

The Indian Socialist Revolutionary Party which is one of the organisations of the revolutionary youth, in its first circular advocates the mass revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and puts forward the following immediate tasks in its work :—

"(1) To carry on propaganda for the basic demands of the masses, to commence with the explanation of the 20 points of the Karachi programme (i.e., the National Congress) and to explain the correctness of the present movement for non-payment of taxes and rent . . . The connection between the present poverty-stricken situation of the peasants and the present social order. The formation of a free society by means of the mass revolution . . . The explanation of how to destroy the present government and how to form free society after the mass revolution.

"(2) To discuss the uselessness of the policy of the National Congress.

"(3) The formation of revolutionary centres among the workers and peasants.

"(4) To prove the necessity of the mass revolution."

This programme of a revolutionary organisation, which is struggling against the National Congress, but which is still entangled in the question of "fundamental rights" adopted at the congress, not only raises the question of revolution, but advocates the agrarian revolution. Here the revolutionary intelligentsia already reflect the interests of the peasants. Groups such as the socialist revolutionary party are being born in various parts of the country. The elements of such groups exist among the members of the leagues of youth, Naujavan, Bharat, Sabha, etc. The Communist Party must take them into account. And therefore *unwillingness* to work among the revolutionary strata of the petty bourgeoisie, and the identification of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie not only weakens the struggle against imperialism for independence, but *assists* the bourgeoisie to preserve their positions and bring disorganisation into the ranks of the toiling masses. Moreover, the *isolation* of national reformism is an obligatory strategic task, signifying a powerful development of the national revolution. Therefore we must even now carry on energetic work among the petty bourgeoisie. This is confirmed even by the small experience of the Indian Communists.

A document of the Bombay Party organisation (June, 1930) states :—

The May-Day strike at Calcutta showed that it is possible, not only to bring out the real working masses to a strike under our slogans, but also to draw part of the petty bourgeoisie with them in connection with the struggle for independence."

The same was shown by the experience of the movement of protest against the shooting of the dockers in Calcutta (1930). The meeting at which the student youth participated was organised by the proletarian revolutionists and took place under their slogans (including the slogan of the general strike, refusal to pay rent and taxes in the zemindar districts, etc.). Examples of such individual actions can be found in other districts. In spite of the mistakes, errors, etc., such actions show that with a correct conducting of the anti-imperialist struggle, if the political initiative is seized by us (the protest movement against the shooting of the dockers formed the beginning of a mass movement in Calcutta), fighting against counter-revolutionary Gandhism, it is possible to liberate the masses from the influence of the National Congress.

The events of recent months show that the drift of considerable strata of the petty bourgeoisie to the side of the revolutionary methods of struggle continues to grow. A leftward swing of the petty bourgeoisie is taking place. The terrorist movement is emerging from the limits of individual acts. In its spread, it is beginning to include the elements of the mass movement. And this is not surprising, because the ruin of the petty bourgeoisie is going on at an accelerated rate. The small landlords are also being ruined. The treacherous conciliatory policy of the National Congress is leading to greater and greater discontent and disillusionment. The growth of discontent of the masses of the people and the weakening of the influence of the appeals for non-violence has found expression in the fact that the Roy group has been compelled to state that it conceives of the establishing of a Constituent Assembly by a revolt. In expressing its sympathy for a revolutionary revolt now, the Roy group simultaneously undermines the developing peasant movement for the non-payment of taxes, breaks the preparations for the railway strike, carries on negotiations with Mehta, Giri and Co., slurs over the bourgeois class character of the National Congress and its connections with the landlord system, etc., i.e., interferes with the real preparation and mobilisation of the masses for the revolutionary revolt. Thus, by continuing in practice their treacherous work, the Roy group is *compelled* (in 1932) to say that it is in favour of a rebellion. This once more emphasises the mistaken position of those Communists who, in practice, do not understand the task of mobilising all the demo-

cratic forces for the struggle against British imperialism, a struggle which is connected with the isolation of national-reformism in all its forms.

COMMUNISTS AND THE AGRARIAN MOVEMENT.

The lagging behind of the Communist movement is also shown in the weak contacts of Communists with the agrarian movement. In some places, for example in some districts of the Punjab and Bengal, the Communists are connected with the agrarian movement through the peasant organisations. In the other parts of the country the activity of the Communist Party has not progressed further than propagandist work (and that chiefly among the town workers). The Communist groups carry on agitation in their papers, in some towns they have held a series of demonstrations of solidarity with the peasants (in Bombay a demonstration in defence of the peasants of Burma, etc.), have issued a series of leaflets (some of them illegal), have carried on some work among the workers who are connected with the villages. The platform of action of the C.P. India has an agrarian section. For the first time the peasants have had a whole revolutionary programme put before them, representing the interests of the toiling peasants. The wide distribution of this programme, and the mobilisation of the broad masses around it, is a most important task.

However, the immediate task which is the key link in respect to the development of the revolution and the growth of Communism and the weakening of national reformism is a mass movement for "non-payment of rent, debts, taxes." The movement for non-payment has at present a mass *spontaneous* character and, at the given stage, is the chief form of the peasant movement. The movement for non-payment has swept over the head of the National Congress. The leaders of the National Congress, who in 1931 played with the slogan of non-payment, have now, when the movement has become a fact, abandoned it and are beginning to sabotage it and hinder it. In the question of the mass Indian movement for the non-payment, the interests of the bourgeois National Congress, connected with the landlord system, and the interests of the peasants widely diverge. Thus the mass Indian movement for non-payment will *assist* in the exposure of the National Congress, the growth of class differentiations and the liberation of the peasants from the influence of the nationalist bourgeoisie. The nation-wide movement for non-payment means a tremendous strengthening of the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses of India against British imperialism. The Indian bourgeoisie and the imperialists well understand this. Against it they now concentrate their main blow.

In the near future the Communists are faced with two tasks: One is to take part in the spontaneous movement for non-payment and take the line of converting it into an all-Indian movement, forming peasant committees, etc., in general following the instructions of the platform of action of the C.P. India. The second is to call together, mobilise and utilise all the revolutionary democratic elements for the development of the non-payment movement. Practice shows that among the members of the youth leagues, among the rank and file supporters of the National Congress, among the members of the trade unions who follow the National reformists, etc., there are many people capable and prepared, not only to support, but to take an energetic part in the organisation of the non-payment movement.

The attraction of these elements is an *obligatory* task. It is also connected with the fact that the agrarian and anti-imperialist streams of the movement are beginning to join, and in the conditions of deepening crisis, the discontent of the toiling masses, the revolutionary hate, and the struggle against the existing order, and national oppression are developing and will develop ever wider. The Communist Party, taking part in the movement for non-payment and organising it, sending organisers, utilising workers connected with the villages, attracting the revolutionary democratic elements and launching proper slogans, will not only be able comparatively rapidly to grow into a big force, but also to start in practice to win the leadership of the movement of all the people. The Communist Party is beginning by the concrete experience of the struggle of the peasant masses to isolate the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois National Congress, and, liberating the peasants from the influence of national reformism, will be able to energetically put forward the preparations for the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolutions in India.

PROBLEMS OF CONSTRUCTION IN INDIA.

The open letter of the Communist Parties of China, Great Britain and Germany analyses in detail the chief shortcomings and the immediate organisational tasks of the Indian Communist movement.

The structure of the Communist Party has not yet emerged from the stage of single isolated local Communist groups and organisations with little contact with the working masses. There are such facts as the existence in some towns of several Communist groups or groups counting themselves Communist, not connected with each other, issuing their own papers, etc.

However, the tremendous upsurge of the mass movement, the degree of class differentiation, the experience and the present stage of development of

the Communist movement sharply raise as an *immediate* task the necessity of a struggle to unite all Communist groups and found a united All-Indian Communist Party.

It is also a struggle for the Party to develop initiative from below, to strengthen the local organisations, to build up local organisations, calling on the class-conscious workers to gather the revolutionary workers in their factories into trade union groups, without waiting for an organiser to come from outside. At present in India the struggle for the Party is not only the work of a small number of existing groups, but of all thinking class-conscious workers and revolutionary intellectuals who stand on the platform of the Communist programme, and who are ready to struggle for independence, and the interests of the working class and the peasants.

In direct connection with this is the elimination of the provincialism which exists among the Communist groups, the habit of being engrossed in local tasks, of contrasting local tasks to all-Indian tasks. Such a position objectively leads to a strengthening of the position of national-reformism and the weakening of the tempo of development of the Communist Party, including agitation and organisation in the localities.

In practice it happens that in some of the chief questions of all-Indian significance—the all-Indian trade union movement and the organisation of the unorganised workers, the general strike, the struggle for the unity of the workers' ranks, the movement for non-payment of rent and taxes, the anti-imperialist struggle—the Communists lose initiative and do not take the line of winning influence, of converting the working class into the leader, the hegemony of the masses of the people. With this is connected the vacillations on the question of the slogan of the general strike, the underestimation of the degree of class-consciousness of the proletariat, the rôle of the petty bourgeoisie, the weak connections with the peasants, the unprincipled group struggle, etc.

The elimination of these mistaken views in the struggle for an all-Indian Party is the *fundamental* political question, on the rapid solving of which depends to a great extent the further course of development of the revolutionary struggle in India.

The Indian Communists must firmly realise that the struggle for the Party is a struggle for the independent proletarian class movement (and connected with this, is the struggle against national reformism in all its varieties) on the basis of a struggle for the masses. *To the masses*, exposing the national reformist leaders—*this at present is the path* to the formation of a strong Bolshevik Communist Party and the conversion of the working class into the hegemony of the toilers of India.

QUESTIONS OF CONCRETE AND OPERATIVE PARTY LEADERSHIP

By O. BEVER.

IN proportion to the further sharpening of the crisis of the capitalist system, and further maturing of the pre-requisites for a revolutionary crisis in the chief capitalist countries, the Communist Parties are more and more insistently faced with the *question of concrete and operative leadership* in the conditions of growing police terror, and the complete illegality of Party work.

What is concrete and operative leadership? Only leadership which is expressed in systematic aid, instruction, and verification of fulfilment of the general line of the Party and the Communist International according to the peculiarities of individual important sectors of the class struggle (industrial districts, big factories, centres, the revolutionary peasant movements, etc.) can be called concrete. The opposite of this concrete leadership is "leadership by circulars" as usually practised until recently (and not completely eliminated even now), in the form of general directives for all Party organisations, without taking the specific peculiarities of each organisation into account or concentrating on the most important sectors. Such a form of leadership is very harmful at present, as in view of the irregularity of the revolutionary upsurge—and in present conditions this irregularity is continually growing—the Party committees can only fulfil their leading function if they unfailingly take the concrete peculiarities of every sector of the front of the revolutionary class struggle carefully into account.

That leadership may be termed operative party leadership, whose main content is the ensuring of rapid reaction by the lower Party organisations (and the mass non-Party organisations connected with them—trade unions, etc.) to all the changes in the circumstances of the class struggle, to all the conditions of the defence of the interests of the worker and peasant masses. Operative leadership is the antithesis of "resolution leadership" as usually practised (and not completely eliminated to the present moment), consisting in the fact that the Party committees make a decision, vote for a line, etc., while no one subsequently checks the fulfilment of these decisions. In addition, it has happened (and, unfortunately, still happens), that the decisions themselves are very late, very long and abstract. "Circular" and "resolution" forms of leadership are typical examples of a bureaucratic Party apparatus. It is precisely in opposition to these forms of Party leadership that we must put forward concrete and operative Party leadership.

Thus the basic attributes of concrete and operative Party leadership must be: (1) The maximum

proximity to the cells (factory and street) and to the fractions of the lower mass organisations (trade union, sport, co-operative, etc.). (2) The maximum mobility of the organs of Party leadership (and consequently the reduction of the radius of action of every organisation—no unwieldy membership; the maximum reduction of the apparatus—departments, permanent commissions; the determined liquidation of unnecessary meetings and conferences; and rapid tempos in carrying on necessary ones. Every member of a Party committee must know what he is personally responsible for, and what he has to do).

It is unnecessary to prove that the Party leaders must be in the closest possible contact with the cells, and the fractions of the lower mass organisations. The leadership of the developing struggles of the masses stands on the order of the day—how else can the correct solution of this central task of the moment be ensured? This approach means, above all, practically: that those Parties whose District Party Committees have very large areas of action, must make them smaller. We note that this work has been carried out, in the main, by the C.P. of Germany, and is being carried on, at the moment, by the C.P. of France. This work is absolutely imperative and will not brook delay.

In addition to this work of reducing the size of the districts, the central committees must now concentrate on the establishment of strong local and sectional Party committees, capable of independently leading the mass revolutionary movement. It is especially important that every cell has a strong leading core (bureau) which has authority among all members of the cell, and in the eyes of the non-Party workers.

The basic idea of the reorganisation of the Communist Parties on the basis of factory cells is that factory cells will be formed in the factories (and especially in the big ones) which will be capable of reacting to all the events of factory life, and also everything taking place outside the factory gates, all the main political events in the country and the world. It is also necessary for the factory to be able to take an active part (and to actually take this part) in the discussion and decision of all the basic Party questions. This can only be achieved if there are in the factory cell (*among the workers of the given factory*) good Party workers, worker-leaders who are popular and connected with the masses. If there are no such leaders in the factory at the moment, they must be found and promoted from among the most advanced workers, and educated with the greatest insistence, meanwhile attaching a worker to

the factory cell as representative of the Party committee, or instructor, who *physically* will be always acquainted with all the activity of the cell, and *politically*, could be responsible to the Party leadership for the political and mass work of the given cell.

Before going underground, the C.P. of Germany made persistent endeavours to supply every factory cell with its own instructor, selected by the corresponding local or sectional committee. This measure of the C.C. of the C.P. of Germany for establishing living contacts between the Party committees and the cells should be welcomed. It is especially desirable that such representatives and instructors be comrades who understand the given cell well (e.g., from among the ex-workers at the given factory), who are capable of participating in all the everyday work of the factory cells. Such measures make it much easier to go underground. This is a lesson to all Communist Parties.

At the same time, it is necessary to ensure most perseveringly that every cell has a leading core (bureau, secretary) capable of independently carrying in the line of the Party and the Comintern. This is fundamental. If it is necessary to attach a representative, or a special instructor for a more or less prolonged time (or even a whole group of several persons) for the formation of such a cell leadership, or the establishing of a correct line in the everyday work of the cell, this must certainly be done, of course. The main task of these representatives and instructors must be to help the cells which they serve. They must help the cells to become so strong that they will be in a position in the future to independently decide all the basic questions on the operation of the general line of the Party correctly. In connection with this, the main decisive demand which must be made upon the representatives and instructors is that, first of all, they must help to discover, and assist the increase of Party activists, helping to find new leaders and attracting them into practical work. It would be absolutely incorrect to consider that the cell cannot work properly if it has not an instructor. It is necessary to fight most decisively against such a view, as it inevitably leads to passivity of the factory cells. It is particularly important for the cells to have such a strong independent leadership in the circumstances of underground work, when the connections of the factory cells with the corresponding Party committees are rendered very difficult and may be broken off completely for a fairly long period.

The second important condition for ensuring operative leadership (again, particularly in underground conditions) is good, living and very rapid contacts between the factory cells and the corresponding Party committees which directly lead the work of the factory cells (local or district committees). Instructors and representatives of the Party committees play a big part in the matter of improving

these contacts and particularly in that of arranging their work properly, and in a number of cases the decisive part; but the main course in this direction must be taken for attracting the best activists of the factory cells to systematic work in the Party committees (as members of the committees, bringing them into participation in the enlarged sessions, to conferences, etc.).

It must be regarded as absolutely abnormal when there are not activists from the chief factory cells, from the fractions of the chief mass organisations in the lower Party committees (this is also true in regard to the C.C., but particularly with regard to the lower Party committees). Such a Party committee (especially the local and district committees) will inevitably be split away from its basis and cannot lead the work of the cells and the mass organisations as it should, and this gap cannot be filled by any instructor. In places where such a situation has arisen, it is necessary to hasten the calling of a Party conference which must re-elect the given Party committee, and, without waiting for the conference, the representatives of the chief factory cells and fractions of mass organisations should be co-opted on to the committee (it will be best of all if these representatives are not appointed by a decision of the committee, but elected by the corresponding cells and fractions, from among the best activists who are most closely connected with the masses, and popular leaders of the masses). Our German comrades at present will have to take very serious steps in this matter, as even before the Party went underground there were very few workers from the factories in the district and local Party committees. This situation will inevitably get worse now in connection with the underground position if the C.C. does not take the necessary counter-measures at once.

The conversion of the local and district committees, and the factory and street cells into strongly initiative Party organisms, connected with the masses, uniting the most advanced revolutionary leaders who are popular among the masses, will make the work of the C.C. and the district committees vastly easier. These higher centres of the Party leadership will then have the fullest possibility of concentrating on the chief thing—the assuring of the unwavering Party line in the work of the local Party organisations, so that all the peculiarities of local Party work will be taken into account in the struggle for the general line. The instructors and representatives of the C.C. and the district committees must first of all act in this direction. In addition, the C.C. and the district committees must be required to bring about a strengthening of the work of the Party Press, utilising the latter in the widest way (periodical publications, pamphlets, leaflets, etc.) with the aim of instructing the local Party organisations, the individual members of the Party, and the sympathising workers, tirelessly popularising the general Party line

through all species of Party literature, and especially concentrating it according to individual sections of the front of the revolutionary struggle. In these conditions, the apparatus for distributing the Party Press acquires great importance, the development of a network of groups of friends of the Party Press, and also a wide movement of worker correspondents.

In connection with the closing of the legal Party papers (as, for example, at present in Germany), a tremendous rôle is attained by the factory papers, and hence the importance of the task of the C.C. to supply these factory papers with the necessary material through a special central and district Press bureau. Through the Party Press, the central leading organs of the Party can ensure the leadership of the struggle directly right down to the factory cells and individual Party members, and can also show the path of the revolutionary struggle to the wider circle of readers of the Party Press.

A necessary condition for concrete operative leadership is also the correct division of labour inside the Party committees, and a correct internal structure of the Party cells (factory and street).

The whole experience of Party structure shows that the departments of the Party committees in their previous form no longer correspond to the needs of the moment. They are now becoming a kind of halfway house between the Party committee and the Party organisations they serve. Even before the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the Comintern gave directions to liquidate trade union departments in all Parties. With regard to the C.P.G.B., the Comintern issued directions to liquidate all the departments in the C.C. of the Party. After the XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I., the C.P. of Austria, Germany and Czecho-Slovakia reduced the number of departments in the C.C. to two, on their own initiative, leaving the organisational department and the agitprop, and dividing the functions of the previously existing departments of the C.C. between them.

This reorganisation is very instructive. Its internal idea is that all the branches of Party work are directly under the control of the secretariat, and thus the secretariat becomes an organ acting directly, without questions previously passing through the apparatus of the departments as was the case previously. Evidently, in the reorganisation of the Party apparatus carried out by these three Parties, not everything is as it should be. Further supplementary changes will be required, but this same line must be adhered to, and other Parties should make use of this experience. To a still greater extent this applies to district and local Party committees. A question—decided by a Party committee—must be passed with the greatest possible speed to the lower organisations for practical operation, and vice versa, information on the activity of the lower Party organisations—on various facts of the class struggle, must receive an estimation from the Party com-

mittee with the greatest possible speed, i.e., the number of intermediate links must be reduced to a minimum here also, best of all to zero.

What does it mean, that the Party committee must immediately react to events? It means firstly, a determined liquidation of the situation which is frequently to be met with, at present, in which the secretary (or organiser) alone works in the Party committee, or at best, one or two paid functionaries besides the secretary. It is necessary to establish a definite rule that the secretary will decide only narrowly operative questions and matters dealing with the apparatus, that all questions which are in any way considerable questions of Party work be decided collectively, and all the basic questions must compulsorily be decided at plenary sessions of the Party committee.

The natural question may arise: Will not such a method have an effect on the operative solution of questions? If properly carried out, it will not. If under the conditions of the struggle at the moment it is impossible to ensure a rapid calling of a plenum of the bureau, special executive committees can be formed, etc.

The collective solution of questions will give two tremendous advantages. It will greatly enhance the chances of a proper decision of the question as the result of a mutual exchange of opinions and mutual criticism, and will help in the growth of responsibility to the organisations. On the other hand, the realisation of all Party members will be strengthened that the decision adopted collectively, as the result of weighing up all the circumstances of the matter, must unflinchingly be carried out. The collective decision of questions strengthens the central leadership. But here we should recall the following important statement made by Lenin in 1902 in the "Letter to a Comrade on our Organisational Tasks":

"If in respect to the ideological and practical *leadership* of the movement and the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat we need the *greatest possible centralisation*, however, with regard to *knowledge* of the movement by the centre of the Party (and consequently by the Party as a whole), in respect to *responsibility* to the Party we require the *greatest possible decentralisation*. . . . We must centralise the leadership of the movement. We must also *decentralise* as much as possible the *responsibility to the Party* of every individual member to the Party, of every participator in the work, of every circle in the Party or affiliated to it (and we must do it *for this*, because centralisation is impossible without knowledge). This decentralisation is a necessary condition for the revolutionary centralisation and a necessary corrective to it. For the centre not only to advise, argue and dispute (as has been done, up to now), but really direct the orchestra, it is necessary for it to know exactly who, where and which violin is

playing, where and how each instrument was learned and is being learned, who, where and why is playing false notes (when the music begins to hurt the ears), and who, how and whither is needed to be transferred to correct the dissonance," etc.*

As adapted to the concrete conditions of the present activity of the Communist Parties and especially the Communist Parties of capitalist countries, in which the pre-requisites of a revolutionary crisis are rapidly growing (Germany), and where, in connection with the growing sharpening of class contradictions the Communist Parties have to carry on their activity in circumstances of preparation for going underground (Czecho-Slovakia), these statements of Comrade Lenin practically require first of all the division of labour inside the Party committees (among the members of the bureau and the secretariat) so that every branch of Party work will be led by a responsible leader who has the possibility of wide initiative and has a small apparatus for carrying out his functions, while this wide initiative of the leaders of the various branches of Party work must be based on the collective decision of all the important questions, and the strictest discipline with regard to the rapid and exact fulfilment of decisions and other directions of the Party leadership. These main functions of Party work are as follows: (1) contacts with higher Party organs and with lower Party organisations and the Y.C.L., co-ordination of all branches of Party work and control of the fulfilment of Party directions; (2) finance; (3) editing the Party organ; (4) the publishing and distribution of Party literature (legal and illegal); (5) the direction of the work in the army; (6) the direction of work in mass organisations.

For such countries as Germany—with a well-developed network of various mass organisations, the majority of which are still in the hands of the enemies of the revolutionary workers' movement—it is impossible to bring about concrete operative leadership if there are not strong Party fractions inside these mass organisations, directly and closely connected with the corresponding Party committee. With the same aim, the fractions in the mass organisations must be well linked up with the factory cells, in their work must rely on the factory cells, while the factory cells, in turn, must surround themselves with a network of all kinds of legal and semi-legal factory and non-factory organisations—trade union, sporting, co-operative, cultural, educational, etc.

In respect to factory cells, we should include among the chief branches of Party work: (a) contacts with the Party committees, with the Y.C.L. and the section cells in the departments of the factory; the co-ordination of all forms of the Party work of the cell and checking the fulfilment of the directions of

Party leadership; (b) the guidance of trade union work in the factory and contacts with the corresponding trade union fractions and those of the unemployed organisations; (c) the distribution of Party literature (legal and illegal) in the factory; (d) the organisation of factory self-defence; (e) the treasurer; (f) the factory paper.

All these organisational outlines (see "C.I." No. 12, Vol. 9) should be regarded only as an orientation. In every concrete case the internal organisational structure of a Party committee and a Party cell must be suitable to all the peculiarities of the given case, and must necessarily correspond to the number of activists in existence, the degree of their training, the material resources possessed by the Party organisation, etc., etc. The main thing which must be preserved in all these outlines can be reduced to the following: (a) the Party committee and bureau not to be too big, and able to rapidly gather together; (b) there must compulsorily be collective work in the bureau, regular meetings of the plenum of the Party committees to solve all Party questions; (c) a definite division of labour inside the Party committee and the bureau on the principle of centralised leadership and decentralised functions; (d) a capable combination of legal, semi-legal and illegal methods of Party work; (e) the selection of popular leaders of the workers who are well connected with the masses for the organs of Party leadership; (f) the swiftest possible reacting to all events, and the correcting of mistakes which are made in the course of the work itself, and the extension and changing of the work according to later directions of the higher Party organs.

Finally, it should be remembered that all the organisational measures for carrying out concrete operative leadership in all conditions must be a means for the better realisation of the general line, a means of carrying on a real, more definite and most consistent struggle against all deviations and vacillations from the general line and against a conciliatory attitude to these deviations and vacillations.

A special article will be given with more detailed concreteness on the tasks of Party construction for Germany in the present conditions of fascist terror.

The capitalist world, prepared by the economic crisis, is moving with increased speed in the direction of great social convulsions. The XII Plenum of the E.C.C.I. warned all Communist Parties that in the present circumstances of the end of capitalist stabilisation they must be prepared for sharp changes and sudden outbursts. To ensure this preparedness, the Communist Parties must tirelessly work for the strengthening of their organisations, securing the conversion of them into genuine iron Bolshevik organs capable, in any police conditions, of mobilising the masses in the struggle for a revolutionary way out of the present crisis, and of leading this struggle.

* Lenin, Vol. V.

OUR MARTYRS

THE further extension of the war front in Manchuria, and the frantic preparations for military intervention against the Soviet Union, have aggravated the barbarous terrorism of the military-police-monarchistic Government against the advance guard of the Japanese proletariat. At present, white terror in Japan has reached such a stage that the leaders of the Communist Party are simply murdered in the police stations, instead of sending them to jail. Already fifty-eight comrades have been murdered in prison in the last four years. *Comrade Ueda* is one of the latest victims. He was one of the founders of the Communist Party in Japan, which was illegally established in July, 1922, and was elected a member of the Control Commission of the Party and also worked as one of the editors of the Party organ, "The Red Flag."

He was arrested in 1923. After his release from seven months' imprisonment, he became one of the editors of the Party organs: *Marxism* and *The Proletarian News*. He was again arrested in 1928, and kept in jail up to October, 1931. He conducted himself like a real Bolshevik when examined by the police; he told them nothing, and continued a vehement fight in prison. As soon as he was released on bail, owing to illness, he restarted his strenuous work as a member of the Central Committee of the Party. After six months he was again arrested and was secretly killed, because he kept the Party's secrets with his life. His dead body has not yet been found; as the Government fears the indignation and fight of the masses against the bloody bourgeoisie and landlords.

On the 29th October, 1932, the Mikado's Court of Justice sentenced four leaders of the Communist Party to life imprisonment and 177 comrades to 776 years of penal servitude. On the same day, the Government made mass arrests of the revolutionary workers and peasants throughout the country, the largest in the last three years. According to information, 4,000 workers were arrested in Tokyo alone. Among the arrested were found many leading comrades of the Party, and revolutionary trade unions.

Comrade Iwata was one of the first victims. He was murdered at the Metropolitan Police Bureau on the 3rd November. The cause of his death has been proven by a post-mortem to be internal haemorrhage.

Comrade Iwata was the son of a poor peasant. After heavy toil at an early age, he studied in the university, and during his study he became one of the leaders of the revolutionary university students' movement, and was arrested in 1926. After his release from jail he played an active rôle in the Industry and Labour Research Institute, in the political journal: "Political Criticism," in the Workers' and Peasants' Party, and in the election campaign in 1928, etc. Escaping from the mass arrests of the 15th March, 1928, he took part in the reorganisation of the Party and carried out important and most dangerous organisational work with great energy. He was arrested in August, 1929, and kept in jail until October, 1930. Immediately after his release he went underground and took a leading part in organising and Bolshevising the Party which had suffered great damage in July, 1930. The Party history since then is a record of a most persistent, heroic and Bolshevik struggle, which has raised its prestige among the workers and peasants and gained wide influence among them; thanks to such a struggle, it founded a strong-base in the workshops and villages. The Party carried on a revolutionary struggle against the predaceous war in China by organising many illegal demonstrations, organising revolutionary soldiers in barracks and on warships, etc. Comrade Iwata stood at the head of these activities.

We have lost two experienced fighters at a moment when the Party must prepare for a decisive struggle against the military-police-monarchy, for converting imperialist war into civil war, for the overthrow of Japanese imperialism. This was a great loss for a young Party. But the Party did not shrink from its task. It has recovered quickly from the heavy blow because it had already been founded on a Bolshevik basis, with the devoted efforts of the present C.C. of the Party. A few days after the attack on the Party in October, the Party organised mass demonstrations on the 5th and 7th November, and also organised a series of mass funeral meetings protesting against the murder of its revolutionary leaders. The heroism, selfless devotion and fighting spirit of these two martyrs will live forever in the memory of the revolutionary workers and peasants of Japan.